

**PART II: LEA APPLICATION**  
**Title I School Improvement Funds**  
**School Improvement Grant Application**  
**Grant Award Period: March 31, 2012 – September 30, 2014**  
**Grant Application Draft Due Date: February 1, 2012**  
**Final Draft Due March 1, 2012**

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		
	<b>LEA Application</b>	
	LEA Cover Sheet	
	Assurances	L-1
	LEA Waiver	
	Tennessee SIG Timeline	L-3
	I. General Information	L-4
	A. Overview	L-4
	Funding Priority and Schools to be Served	L-6
	B. Funding	L-7
	C. Timeline and Milestones	L-7
	D. Reporting and Evaluation Requirements	L-8
	E. Application, Application Review and Grant Award	L-9
	II. SIG Schools	L-10
	A. Schools to be Served	L-10
	Tier I or III Schools Eligible to be in the State ASD	L-11
	B. Tier III Schools to be Served	L-11
	C. Schools that the LEA will not Serve	L-11
	III. LEA Descriptive Information	L-13
	IV. School Level Descriptive Information	L-18
Appendix A	Tier I, II, III Schools (Determined in 2010-2011) & Tier I,II Selection Pools	
Appendix B	Title I School Improvement Grant Rubric 2011-2014	
Appendix C	External Provider's Form	
Appendix D	Budget Spreadsheet	
Appendix E	Turnaround Model Forms	
Appendix F	Restart Model Forms	
Appendix G	Closure Model Forms	
Appendix H	Transformation Model Forms	
Appendix I	Tier III School Interventions	

**TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT**  
**Grant Award Period: March 31, 2012--September 30, 2015**  
**Grant Application Draft Due Date: February 1, 2012**  
**Final Draft Due Date: March 1, 2012**  
**LEA COVER SHEET**

**NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDRESS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CITY, STATE AND ZIP CODE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**AREA CODE/TELEPHONE NUMBER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FAX NUMBER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DISTRICT GRANT CONTACT PERSON:** \_\_\_\_\_

**POSITION/TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDRESS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CITY, STATE AND ZIP CODE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**AREA CODE/TELEPHONE NUMBER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**EMAIL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE SUBMITTED:** \_\_\_\_\_



**PART II: LEA APPLICATION**  
**Title I School Improvement Funds**  
**School Improvement Grant Application for 1003 (g)**  
**(Coordinated with RTTT and 1003(a) Funds)**  
**Grant Application Period: March 31, 2012 – September 30, 2015**

**A. Assurances: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.** *(Items 1-4 are federal SIG requirements; items 5-11, TDE lists other federal and state requirements.)*

The LEA must assure that it will—

- 1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- 2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the TDE's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the TDE) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- 3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements;
- 4) Report to the TDE the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements;
- 5) Modify its practices and policies as necessary to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively;
- 6) Meet the requirement that School Improvement Funds will be used only to supplement and not supplant; federal, state, and local funds a school or school district would otherwise receive;
- 7) Agree to the lower-tier certification covering lobbying and debarment/suspension under 34 CFR Parts 82 and 85;
- 8) Participate in evaluation studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, the Tennessee Department of Education, and the local school district;
- 9) Complete and submit an end of the year written report to the Tennessee Department of Education documenting the use of these funds and the impact it has on school improvement.
- 10) The State may retain Section 1003 (a) school improvement funds for direct technical assistance to eligible schools and districts for its statewide system of support as allowed in Section 1003 (b) (2);
- 11) ARRA funds (Title I-A)
  - A. Comply with all applicable laws and regulations including any directives or requirements from the Tennessee Recovery Act Management (TRAM) Office;
  - B. Submit reporting requirements as specified by federal and state laws, regulations and/or policies;
  - C. Track all ARRA funds and expenditures in separate budget accounts and categories as required.
  - D. Submit reports requested by the State.

<b>Print Name of Director of Schools (or designee):</b>	<b>Signature of Director of Schools (or designee):</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Print Name of Board Chair:</b>	<b>Signature of Board Chair</b>	<b>Date</b>

Signatures of the ESEA Field Service Consultant and the local Title I director indicate the proposed plan verifies that the application addresses the designated purposes for the use of these School Improvement funds.

The School Improvement funds are appropriately allocated. The proposal is in substantially approvable form. The application will be forwarded to the Office of Federal Programs in Nashville for final approval.

<b>Name of School District:</b>		
<b>Title I Director's Name:</b>	<b>Title I Director's Signature:</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>ESEA Field Service Consultant's Name:</b>	<b>ESEA Field Service Consultant's Signature:</b>	<b>Date</b>

*ARRA Fraud Notice*

*Recipients of awarded funds made available under the Recovery Act shall promptly refer to an appropriate inspector general any credible evidence that a principal, employee, agent, contractor, sub-grantee, subcontractor, or other person has submitted a false claim under the False Claims Act or has committed a criminal or civil violation of laws pertaining to fraud, conflict of interest, bribery, gratuity, or similar misconduct involving those funds.*

**LEA Waiver**

The LEA must check the following waiver if it will be implemented. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, *the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.*

- ☐ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School(s))

## Tennessee SIG Timeline

**Please note:** The Tennessee Department of Education received a waiver from USED to allow it to carryover its federal FY 2010 SIG funds and award them through a competition conducted during 2011-2012. The timeline is reflective of the impact of the waiver.

Technical assistance webinars and on-site meetings with LEAs	November 2011 to Dec. 2011
Release of USED approved application to LEAs	December 2, 2011
Letter of intent due to the TDE	December 15, 2011
Application, draft 1, due to the TDE	February 1, 2012
Grants applications reviewed and input provided	February 1 to February 24, 2012
Application final draft due to the TDE	March 1, 2012
Grant award notification letters sent to LEAs	March 31, 2012
Grant applications and awards posted to state website	March 31, 2012
Pre-implementation--if included in grant	Upon receipt of grant award through start of School Year 2012-2013
Implementation Year 1	School Year 2012-13
Milestone Visits	Sept. 2012, Nov. 2012, Mar. 2013, May 2013
Evaluation of Year 1 for Year 2 funding by TDE	May-June 2013
LEA submission of updated budget/grant for Year 2/3	July 2013
Implementation Year 2	School Year 2013-14
Milestone Visits	Sept. 2013, Nov. 2013 Mar. 2014, May 2014
Evaluation of Year 2 for Year 3 funding by TDE	May-June 2014
LEA submission of updated budget/grant for Year 3	July 2014
Implementation Year 3	School Year 2014-15
Milestone Visits	Sept. 2014, Nov. 2014, Mar. 2015, May 2015
Grant evaluation reporting	July 2015

## I. General Information

### A. Overview

Tennessee has a comprehensive statewide system of support for public schools and local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state. The system differentiates support to schools and districts based on their need as determined by the results of annual adequate yearly progress determinations. This grant application addresses how LEAs with the lowest achieving schools and the greatest capacity can use the funds to raise the achievement of their students to enable the school to meet state proficiency targets.

Section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA), also known as the School Improvement Grant (SIG) Fund, authorizes funds to help LEAs address the needs of schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring in order to improve student achievement. In conjunction with basic grant allocations and school improvement funds reserved under Section 1003(a), Section 1003(g) School Improvement Funds are to be used to leverage change and improve technical assistance under sections 1116 and 1117 of Title I, Part A, through LEAs targeting activities toward measurable outcomes as described in this document.

Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010, school improvement ‘g’ funds are to be focused on the State’s “Tier I”, “Tier II”, and “Tier III” schools. Tier I and Tier II compose those called *persistently lowest-achieving schools*.

Additional available resources are listed on the school improvement page of the Federal Programs’ website.

### **Tier I and II**

**Tennessee State Board of Education (SBE) Identification of *Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools* submitted to USED is as follows:**

Two “tiers” of low achieving schools compose the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

- **Tier I** – Any Title I high priority school (a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as defined in ESEA) that is either in the lowest five percent of all Title I high priority schools in the ALL subgroup for math and reading/language arts combined achievement or is a Title I secondary school (defined as a high school in TN) with a graduation rate of less than 60% (for two out of the last three years).
- **Tier II** – Any Title I secondary school eligible but not “served” by Title I that is either in the lowest five percent of these schools in the ALL subgroup for math and reading/language arts combined achievement or has a graduation rate of less than 60% (for two out of the last three years)

The State of Tennessee has the following process for identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools, referred to as Tier I and Tier II schools. The lowest-achieving five percent is calculated by the numerical rank within each pool of schools (Title I high priority schools and Title I eligible but not served high schools). The numerical rank index is determined based upon the following series of calculations:

- 1) The current year math score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest math percent proficient and advanced;
- 2) The current year reading/language arts score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest reading/language arts percent proficient and advanced;
- 3) The math and reading/language arts ranks are summed for current year rank index;
- 4) Two prior years are ranked using the same method;
- 5) Two prior year ranks are averaged for prior years rank index;
- 6) Current year rank index and prior years rank index are summed to create the combined rank index;
- 7) Lastly, five percent of schools with the highest numerical final rank index are identified.

Notes:

High priority schools are defined as schools with an improvement status or those in improvement, corrective action, or any form of restructuring as specified in ESEA. Elementary and secondary schools are weighted equally.

For schools serving both grade spans, high school achievement data is used.

Secondary schools are defined as high schools.

In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

**Tier III** - In addition, Tier III schools are any Title I high priority school (a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as defined in ESEA) that is not Tier 1; therefore, did not rank in the lowest 5% of all Title I high priority schools in the **ALL** subgroup for math and reading/language arts achievement nor is a high priority high school with a graduation rate of less than 60%.

The table with the eligible schools and their qualifying information is in Appendix A.



## Funding Priority and Schools to be Served

The goal of School Improvement ‘g’ funds is to target persistently lowest-achieving schools to implement robust and comprehensive reforms to transform school culture dramatically and increase student outcomes.

The TDE has posted a listing of all Tier I, II, and III schools on the Federal Programs’ website: <http://tennessee.gov/education/fedprog/index.shtml> . The required National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number is on the posted list. The LEA must complete a chart for schools that it commits to serve, a chart for state achievement school district, a chart for renewal schools intervention, and another chart for schools it will not serve. A description of the allowable intervention models for Tier I and Tier II are located in the final requirements.

LEAs should refer to the chart below which describes tiers that must be served to receive SIG funds. In addition, the TDE funding priorities listed under the Funding section of this grant application should be reviewed by the LEA.

If an LEA has one or more . . .	In order to get SIG funds, the LEA <u>must</u> commit to serve . . .
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school <i>OR</i> at least one Tier II school <sup>1</sup>
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier II schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier III schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes

## **B. Funding**

Each LEA will be given a score that represents the applicant's demonstration of need for the funds and its commitment to meet the goals for improvement. Successful LEA applicants are awarded a minimum of \$50,000 and up to \$2,000,000 annually per school for the term of the grant. Grant awards will be determined based upon the complexity of the intervention model, size of the school, and costs typically associated with the intervention model. Funds are prioritized by:

- Tier I schools,
- Tier II schools,
- Tier III schools that implement one of the four intervention models.
- Tier III schools that implement comprehensive school improvement strategies

Grants are renewable for the two subsequent years, with the exception of the closure model, contingent upon progress in implementing and meeting the student achievement goals established by the LEA and approved by the TDE. Each LEA/school will be required to submit an update to its grant, including budget and program information, in order to receive the grant renewal.

## **C. Timelines and Milestones**

LEAs awarded discretionary SI grants that continue to meet the program and student achievement requirements may be funded for two additional years, pending federal SI funding and a successful year one project. Examples of how the TDE will monitor year one progress include:

- 1) Documentation of how the school(s) improvement plans were amended to incorporate the activities, timelines, and milestones for implementation of the intervention model or evidence-based school improvement strategies identified in the application.
- 2) Appropriate use of SIG funds to implement research-and evidence-based school improvement strategies identified in the LEA application for each school for which SI funds were provided.
- 3) Implementation of the final requirements of the grant.
- 4) Implementation of the strategies according to the timeline provided in the LEA/school level descriptive information.
- 5) Increased achievement in the ALL or subgroup category where the school did not meet the LEA or TDE benchmarks.

## **D. Reporting and Evaluation Requirements**

Applicants awarded SI grant funds must satisfy periodic reporting and accountability requirements throughout the term of the grant. These requirements address (a) fiscal accountability, (b) program accountability, (c) fiscal and program reporting, (d) site visits, and (e) internal evaluation.

### **1. Fiscal Accountability**

Each identified school and LEA receiving SI grant funds is responsible for carrying out its school improvement responsibilities under section 1116(b) and (c), respectively.

SIG grant funds awarded under Section 1003(g) funds must be used to supplement not supplant state and local funds that the school would receive in the absence of Title I funds. SIG funds cannot be used to supplant non-federal funds or to replace existing services.

### **2. Program Accountability**

Each LEA and school receiving a SI grant is responsible for carrying out its school improvement responsibilities in accordance with its approved grant application and action plan.

### **3. Fiscal and Program Reporting Requirements**

SI grantees must submit at least quarterly expenditure reports and implementation progress reports to the TDE. The LEA is responsible for ensuring that reports are accurate, complete, and submitted on time. Each district must agree to respond to data requests from TDE and USED including EdFACTS data. All data for the leading indicators listed in section III. A of the final requirements must be collected and submitted as required.

### **4. Site Visits by TDE Representatives**

LEAs and their schools must agree to site visits which will validate information provided in expenditure and progress reports and gather more detailed information on implementation efforts and challenges.

### **5. Internal Evaluation**

LEAs and schools funded under the SI grant program will create and use data systems that include formative and summative assessments to provide staff, students, and parents, and community/business partners continuous feedback, to identify program processing and practices that are resulting in improved teaching and learning and to identify and make adjustments where needed. Each LEA funded will document the monitoring of each SIG school's implementation progress on a quarterly basis. Year One evaluation must include any pre-implementation activities. A report must be sent to the state annually to include leadership team and milestone meeting notes.

## **E. Application Instructions, Application Review, and Grant Award Process**

### **1) Application Instructions:**

Each LEA must submit one LEA SIG application plus an “Intervention Model” application for each eligible school that the LEA commits to serve. It is the expectation of the TDE that the LEA work closely with each eligible school to complete the “Intervention Model” application. There is no word count limit in the text boxes.

The LEA must submit the SIG application electronically to [SIG.Applications@tn.gov](mailto:SIG.Applications@tn.gov). A paper copy of **ONLY** the first two pages of the LEA application must be submitted with original signatures. The LEA should keep a copy of the signed application. These two pages must be sent to Rita Fentress at the address listed below:

Rita Fentress  
TN State Department of Education, Office of LEA Support and Improvement  
5<sup>th</sup> floor – Andrew Johnson Tower  
710 James Robertson Pkwy  
Nashville, TN 37243-0379

### **2) Application Review**

The TDE will organize and coordinate the SI grant application readers and scoring. Application readers will rate each application on its own merits. Readers will rate the applications according to how well an application reflects rubric expectations. The scoring tool is located in Appendix B.

If deemed necessary, an interview with the applicant will be held to help the TDE assess and ensure that the LEA application accurately reflects the LEA’s capacity and commitment to school reform.

### **3) Determination of Award Amounts**

The TDE reserves the right to fund applications at a lesser amount if the grant application does not fully justify the budget expenditures.

### **4) Award Notification**

Successful applicants will be notified within 60 days of the application closing date. Information will also be posted on the TDE Federal Programs website.

## II. Schools to be Served

**A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED:** An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

Using the 2010-2011 Tennessee Tier Status List (Appendix A), an LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve with SIG funds beginning SY 2012-2013 and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	INTERVENTION (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
					turnaround	restart	closure	transformation

Note: An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, including both schools that are being served with FY 2009 SIG funds and schools that are eligible to receive FY 2010 SIG funds, may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools. See section II.A.2(b) of the final requirements.

**B. TIER I OR III SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE TO BE IN THE STATE ACHIEVEMENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (ASD):**

An LEA must identify Tier I or III schools eligible to be in the ASD.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER III

**C. TIER III SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the Tier III schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.**

An LEA must identify Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in Tier III schools that are renewal schools, schools in corrective action or restructuring one by Tennessee's definition.

SCHOOL NAME	NCES ID #	Tier III, SCHOOLS INTERVENTION				
		Turnaround	Transformation	Restart	Closure	No Model/ Comprehensive School Improvement strategies

**D. SCHOOLS THAT THE LEA WILL NOT SERVE:**

An LEA must identify each Tier I school the LEA will **not** serve.

TIER I SCHOOL THE LEA WILL NOT SERVE NAME	NCES ID #

**III. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: An LEA must include the following information in its application for a School Improvement Grant.**

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
- The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and Tennessee has included the information in the appropriate model templates.
  - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.
- (2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.
- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements; Tennessee has included the information in the appropriate model templates.
  - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
  - Align other resources with the interventions;
  - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
  - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
- (4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application.  
Tennessee has included the information in the appropriate model templates.
- (5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.  
Tennessee has included the information in the appropriate model templates.
- (6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.  
Tennessee has included the information in the appropriate model templates.
- (7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.  
Tennessee has included the information in the appropriate model templates.
- (8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.  
Tennessee has included the information in the appropriate model templates.



### III. LEA Descriptive Information

#### A. Comprehensive Needs Assessment

The LEA must demonstrate that it has analyzed the needs of each school in order to select the appropriate intervention model that adequately addresses the needs of the school.

Complete the Comprehensive Needs Assessment portion of the appropriate model template for each Tier I and Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve.

#### B. LEA Capacity

The LEA is required to indicate its capacity to serve schools by reviewing the areas listed below. Considering each of the listed areas, describe the LEA's capacity to serve Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools with school improvement funds.

- 1. LEA support to implementation.** How does the process for support and response to SIG schools differ from the support and response to other schools? (e.g.: principals' direct access on a regular basis to the Superintendent/Director of Schools; central office staff designated to work solely with SIG schools; structure to facilitate a seamless system of support including district SIG staff and areas of curriculum, special populations, student support, human resources, etc.)

- 2. Commitment to support from relevant stakeholders.** What methods did the LEA use to consult with relevant stakeholders including administrators, teachers, staff, parents, teachers' organization, school board and community on the LEA's application and selection of intervention models in its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools? List the stakeholders involved in the application process, consultation dates, and types of communication.

- 3. LEA SIG leadership.** Describe the LEA School Improvement Grant team that will support and oversee the implementation of selected models and strategies in each of its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools. Include descriptions of credentials, competencies, and responsibilities of any new or existing district staff who will serve SIG schools. One member must be team must be the district's Director of Federal Programs.

- 4. LEA Federal Grant Office.** What is the LEA's finance office past history in the management of federal grants? Include any audit findings within the past five years. Does the LEA draw down federal funds at least quarterly?

- 5. Availability of Human Capital.** What is the LEA's strategy for recruitment and selection of effective school leaders, teachers, and staff to work in its lowest performing schools?

- 6. Process for removal of ineffective principals, teachers, and staff.** What is the LEA's process for removal of ineffective principals, teachers, and staff?

- 7. Plans for Evaluation/Monitoring of the Grant.** How will the LEA monitor and evaluate progress toward annual goals for student achievement, SIG leading indicators and implementation of interventions?

- 8. 3 Year Budget** – Provide an LEA 3-year budget sufficient for full and effective implementation of SIG grants for all schools in the approved application throughout the availability of the funds. Complete Appendix D, *Budget and Budget Justification Template*.

**C. Lack of Capacity:** If the LEA is not applying to serve each **Tier I** school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school. This must match the table labeled 'Schools That the LEA WILL NOT serve in section C. The following areas should be addressed:

- The number of Tier I and Tier II schools (and Tier III schools, if funding available);
- Access/proximity to higher performing schools (Closure Model);
- Recruiting ability for principals, especially for rural areas (Turnaround and Transformation models);
- EMO/CMO availability and capacity (Restart model);
- Ability to align funding from other sources with grant activities and to ensure sustainability of the reform (Turnaround Model, Restart Model, Transformation Model);
- Operational flexibility (Turnaround Model, Transformation Model); teacher evaluation system (Turnaround Model, Transformation Model).

**D. Preparation for Implementation of Interventions**

**1. Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.**

Complete the appropriate model template (Appendix E, F, G, H, or I) for each of the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA will serve with SIG funds.

**2. Recruitment, screening, and selection of external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality:**

a. If external providers are to be funded as collaborative partners, describe how the LEA will recruit, screen and select external providers to ensure quality. The LEA must demonstrate a rigorous recruiting, screening, and selection process that includes the following:

- A request for information (RFI) or other process for identification of potential providers.
- A protocol for analysis of the connection between the provider's experience and the district and each school's comprehensive needs assessment.
- A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to include a description of the provider's responsibilities and alignment with each school's needs, as well as the LEA and provider's shared accountability for the full and effective implementation of the intervention model and student achievement in the selected school.
- The LEA's process for monitoring and oversight of the provider's services.

b. Describe how the LEA will recruit, screen, and select external providers of professional development to ensure their quality.

Complete form in Appendix C about external providers, if applicable, and attach to the application.

Please check appropriate box if Appendix is attached. ☐ Yes ☐ No

**3. Alignment of other resources with interventions.** What specific actions will the LEA take to allocate additional funds to its Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools to align those funds awarded under the SI Grant? (e.g. State funds, Title I and other federal funds, 1003(a), RTTT). Please note: The LEA may not use SIG funds to supplant funding or services that would be available to its Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools in the absence of SIG funds

**4. Modification of policies and practices.** Describe existing barriers to full and effective implementation of interventions in Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. What are anticipated barriers? What practices and/or LEA board policies has or will the LEA modify to overcome barriers to the full and effective implementation of intervention models?

- a. Provide the name of School Improvement Grant Coordinator or other person who will address policy and procedural barriers throughout the implementation of the grant.
- b. Date of review and status of LEA board policy;
- c. Date of review and status of LEA practices or procedures;
- d. Date of review and status of handbooks of schools receiving SIG funds;

## 5. Sustainability

a. What additional funding resources will the LEA allocate to its Tier I, Tier II, and/or Tier III schools, including but not limited to federal, state, and local education funds. (e.g., Title I, state and/or other federal grant funding). Please note: The LEA may not use SIG funds to supplant funding or services that would be available to its Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools in the absence of SIG funds.

b. How will the LEA sustain the reforms in its Tier I, Tier II and/or Tier III schools after the period of SIG funding has expired. Include additional measures that it will take to continue reform after the life of the grant.

c. How will the LEA gather and share effective practices from the schools receiving SIG funds with other low-performing schools within the LEA?

**6. Internal Evaluation:** An LEA must monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds to determine whether the school:

1. Is meeting annual goals established by the LEA for student achievement on the State's ESEA assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and

2. Is making progress on the leading indicators described in the final requirements.

The following metrics constitute the leading indicators for the SIG program:

1. Number of minutes within the school year;
2. Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics by student subgroup;
3. Dropout rate;
4. Student attendance rate;
5. Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
6. Discipline incidents;
7. Truants;
8. Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and
9. Teacher attendance rate.

(See section III.A of the final requirements.)

The determination of whether a school meets the goals for student achievement established by the LEA is in addition to the determination of whether the school makes AYP as required by section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA. In other words, each LEA receiving SIG funds must monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools it is serving to determine whether they have met the LEA's annual goals for student achievement and must also comply with its obligations for making accountability determinations under section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.

The LEA should establish annual goals to cover all three years of implementation of the school implementation model.

**Development of Systems for Collection of SIG Data:** LEAs and schools funded under the SI grant program will create and use data systems that include formative and summative assessments to provide staff, students and parents, and community/business partners continuous feedback, to identify program processing and practices that are resulting in improved teaching and learning and to identify and make adjustments where needed. Each LEA funded will document the monitoring of each SIG school's implementation progress on a quarterly basis. The Year One evaluation must include pre-implementation activities. A report must be sent to the state annually to include leadership team and milestone meeting notes.

Briefly describe the districts system for collection of SIG data including formative and summative assessments and for the above described leading indicators for the SIG program.

## **IV. School Level Descriptive Information**

**An LEA must submit this section for each individual school. A separate template for each of the four intervention models for Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools and a Tier III School Plan of Action template for Tier III schools not implementing one of the four intervention models are included with the application package.**

**Tier I and Tier II schools must complete only one of the four intervention model templates:**

- (1) Turnaround (Appendix E); (2) Restart (Appendix F); ; (3) Closure (Appendix G); or (4) Transformation (Appendix H);

**2. Tier III schools must complete only one of the five templates:**

- (1) Turnaround (Appendix E); (2) Restart (Appendix F); (3) Closure (Appendix G); or (4) Transformation (Appendix H); or (5) Tier III School Plan of Action (Appendix H).

# **APPENDIX A**

- 1. Schools served with FY 2009 SIG Funds**
- 2. Tier I, II schools eligible for FY 2010 SIG Funds**
- 3. Tier I Selection Pool eligible for FY 2010 SIG Funds**
- 4. Tier II Selection Pool eligible for FY 2010 SIG Funds**

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Bradford Special School District	4701390	Bradford HS	425			x		
Campbell County	470042	Campbell Co HS	117			x		
Campbell County	470042	Jellico HS	125			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Antioch HS	1257			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Antioch Middle	1052			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Apollo Middle	1258			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Bailey MS	1647			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Brick Church MS	1400			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Cameron Middle	1270			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Glenclyff HS	1299			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Gra-Mar MS	1307			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Hillwood HS	1319			x		x
Davidson County	4703180	Hunters Lane HS	1961			x		x
Davidson County	4703180	Isaac Litton MS	1322			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Jere Baxter MS	1323			x		
Davidson County	4703180	John Early MS	1701			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Maplewood HS	1337			x		x
Davidson County	4703180	Margaret Allen MS	1338			x		
Davidson County	4703180	McGavock HS	1342			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Stratford HS	1370			x		
Davidson County	4703180	West End MS	1382			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Whites Creek HS	1386			x		
Davidson County	4703180	Wright Middle	1389			x		
Hamilton County	4701590	East Ridge Middle	502			x		
Hamilton County	4701590	Hixson HS	750		x			
Hamilton County	4701590	Howard Academy and Tech.	759	x			x	
Hamilton County	4701590	Lookout Valley MS / HS	781			x		
Hamilton County	4701590	Orchard Knob MS	801			x		
Hamilton County	4701590	Red Bank HS	517			x		
Hamilton County	4701590	Sequoyah HS	521			x		
Henderson County	4701800	Lexington HS	603			x		
Henderson County	4701800	Scotts Hill HS	1427			x		x
Knox County	4702220	Austin East High School	767	x				
Knox County	4702220	Bearden Middle	770			x		
Knox County	4702220	Carter HS	725			x		
Knox County	4702220	Central HS	775			x		
Knox County	4702220	Fulton HS	783			x		
Knox County	4702220	South Doyle HS	732			x		
Knox County	4702220	West HS	822			x		

SCHOOLS SERVED WITH FY 2009 SIG FUNDS								
LEA NAME	LEA NCES ID #	SCHOOL NAME	SCHOOL NCES ID #	TIER I	TIER II	TIER III	GRAD RATE	NEWLY ELIGIBLE
Lauderdale County	4702310	Lauderdale MS	1970			x		
Lauderdale County	4702310	Ripley HS	838			x		
Loudon County	4702520	Ft. Loudon MS	893			x		
Loudon County	4702520	Greenback School	896			x		
Madison County	4702580	Jackson Central Merry HS	653			x		
Madison County	4702580	Liberty Tech Magnet HS	2032			x		
Mauzy County	4702760	Mt. Pleasant HS	974		x			
Memphis City	4702940	BT Washington	1016			x		
Memphis City	4702940	Carver HS	1027			x		x
Memphis City	4702940	Cherokee Elementary	1030			x		
Memphis City	4702940	Craigmont HS	1040					
Memphis City	4702940	Cypress Middle	1044			x		
Memphis City	4702940	Fairley HS	1058			x		x
Memphis City	4702940	Fairview Jr. High	1059			x		
Memphis City	4702940	Frayser Middle/High	1064	x			x	
Memphis City	4702940	Hamilton HS	1080	x			x	
Memphis City	4702940	Hamilton Middle	1081			x		
Memphis City	4702940	Hillcrest HS	1085			x		
Memphis City	4702940	Kingsbury HS	1093	x			x	
Memphis City	4702940	Kirby HS	1859			x		x
Memphis City	4702940	Manassas HS	1113	x			x	
Memphis City	4702940	Northside HS	1125	x			x	
Memphis City	4702940	Oakhaven Middle / HS	1127			x		x
Memphis City	4702940	Raleigh Egypt MS	1136	x				
Memphis City	4702940	Sheffield HS	1153	x			x	
Memphis City	4702940	Trezevant HS	1166	x			x	
Memphis City	4702940	Wooddale HS	1186			x		
Monroe County	4703000	Sweetwater HS	1199			x		
Monroe County	4703000	Tellico Plains HS	1201			x		
Sequatchie County	4703750	Sequatchie HS	1544			x		
Sequatchie County	4703750	Sequatchie MS	1546			x		
Union County	4704290	Union Co HS	870			x		x
White County	4704500	White Co HS	1798			x		





**Tennessee TIER 1, 2 and 3 Schools and 2010-11 High Priority Schools**

LEA NCES ID	School NCES ID	District	Title I	School	Grade s	NCLB_Status_2010_11	2010-11 TIER	2010-11 Model	09-10 TIER	09_10 Model	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008
4703180	01350	Davidson County	*	Napier Elementary Enhancement	PK-4	School Improvement 2	T1	ASD-E	T3	Focus	Y				
4701590	00759	Hamilton County	*	Howard School Of Academics	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Imp	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E		Y	68.6%	56.5%	50.9%
4701590	00801	Hamilton County	*	Orchard Knob Middle	6-8	School Improvement 2	T1	ASD-E	T3	Focus	Y				
4702940	01044	Memphis	*	Cypress Middle School	6-8	Corrective Action	T1	ASD-E	T3	Focus	Y				
4702940	01061	Memphis	*	Ford Road Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T1	ASD-E			Y				
4702940	01064	Memphis	*	Frayser High School	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 2 - Imp	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E		Y	66.1%	56.3%	54.8%
4702940	01080	Memphis	*	Hamilton High School	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 4	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E		Y	56.5%	46.4%	54.6%
4702940	01085	Memphis	*	Hillcrest High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T1	ASD-E	T3	Focus		Y	58.8%	58.6%	64.5%
4702940	01093	Memphis	*	Kingsbury High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E		Y	68.2%	53.1%	57.8%
4702940	01958	Memphis	*	Lester Elementary School	PK-8	School Improvement 2	T1	ASD-E	T3	Focus	Y				
4702940	01113	Memphis	*	Manassas High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E	Y	Y	65.0%	54.8%	50.8%
4702940	01125	Memphis	*	Northside High School	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Imp	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E		Y	52.5%	44.2%	50.4%
4702940	01136	Memphis	*	Raleigh Egypt Middle School	6-8	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E	Y				
4702940	01153	Memphis	*	Sheffield High School	9-12	Corrective Action	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E		Y	72.0%	47.3%	53.6%
4702940	01156	Memphis	*	Sherwood Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T1	ASD-E			Y				
4702940	01166	Memphis	*	Trezevant High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T1	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E		Y	66.1%	52.4%	56.6%
4702940	02135	Memphis	*	Westside Middle	7-8	School Improvement 1	T1	ASD-E			Y				
4700180	00039	Bedford County		Community High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2				Y		84.3%	86.3%	84.2%
4701410	00429	Giles County		Giles Co High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T2	Focus		Focus	Y		89.6%	83.4%	77.6%
4701590	00750	Hamilton County		Hixson High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2		T2		Y		79.8%	78.8%	77.9%
4701770	00597	Haywood County		Haywood High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2				Y		76.2%	78.4%	79.7%
4701950	00636	Humboldt		Humboldt High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2				Y		84.7%	84.1%	79.2%
4702520	00900	Loudon County		Loudon High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2				Y		87.0%	86.4%	89.7%
4702760	00974	Maury County		Mt Pleasant High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2		T2		Y		78.2%	80.0%	77.7%
4702820	00993	McMinn County		McMinn High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2				Y		88.1%	89.4%	89.6%
4703000	00409	Monroe County		Sequoyah High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2				Y		90.6%	90.5%	79.9%
4703180	01270	Davidson County	*	Cameron Middle School	5-8	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T3	ASD-E	T3	ASD-E					
4703180	01299	Davidson County	*	Glenduff Comp High School	9-12	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	ASD-E	T3	ASD-E			81.1%	73.3%	66.6%
4702220	00767	Knox County	*	Austin East High/Magnet	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Imp	T3	ASD-E	T1	ASD-E			85.4%	74.9%	75.2%
4702580	00653	Madison County	*	Jackson Central-Merry Acade	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T3	ASD-E	T3	ASD-E			81.5%	63.4%	57.2%
4700180	00037	Bedford County	*	Harris Middle School	6-8	Corrective Action	T3	Renewal	T3	Focus					
4700510	00154	Carter County	*	Hampton Elementary	K-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4700570	00229	Cheatham County	*	East Cheatham Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4700630	00256	Claiborne County	*	Tazewell-New Tazewell Eleme	K-4	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4700690	00265	Cleveland	*	Cleveland High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus		Focus			88.1%	89.3%	81.8%
4703180	01255	Davidson County	*	Amqui Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01257	Davidson County	*	Antioch High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			82.2%	74.7%	71.5%
4703180	01052	Davidson County	*	Antioch Middle School	5-8	Restructuring 1	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal					
4703180	01258	Davidson County	*	Apollo Middle School	5-8	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	Renewal*	T3	Renewal					

Business rules located at end of report.

Highlight BLUE: Originally identified 2009-10

Highlight GREEN: Newly identified 2010-11

TDOE School Improvement Grant Application

Appendix A - Page 4 of 27

### Tennessee TIER 1, 2 and 3 Schools and 2010-11 High Priority Schools

LEA NCES ID	School NCES ID	District	Title I	School	Grade s	NCLB_Status_2010_11	2010-11 TIER	2010-11 Model	09-10 TIER	09_10 Model	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008
4703180	01647	Davidson County	*	Bailey Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01400	Davidson County	*	Brick Church Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01267	Davidson County	*	Buena Vista Elementary Enha	PK-4	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703180	01273	Davidson County	*	Chadwell Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01274	Davidson County	*	Charlotte Park Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01277	Davidson County	*	Cole Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703180	01279	Davidson County	*	Cotton Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01288	Davidson County	*	Dupont Tyler Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703180	01305	Davidson County	*	Goodlettsville Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703180	01307	Davidson County	*	Gra-Mar Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01322	Davidson County	*	Isaac Litton Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01323	Davidson County	*	Jere Baxter Middle School	5-8	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	Renewal*	T3	Renewal					
4703180	01326	Davidson County	*	John B Whitsitt Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01701	Davidson County	*	John Early Paideia Middle Ma	5-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	02149	Davidson County	*	John F. Kennedy Middle Scho	5-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703180	01334	Davidson County	*	Lakeview Elementary Design	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01338	Davidson County	*	Margaret Allen Middle School	5-8	Corrective Action	T3	Renewal	T3	Focus					
4703180	01342	Davidson County	*	McGavock Comp High School	9-12	Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			81.6%	75.8%	76.3%
4703180	01924	Davidson County	*	Pearl Cohn Magnet High Scho	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus					80.5%	68.0%	66.1%
4703180	01370	Davidson County	*	Stratford Comp High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			79.6%	67.6%	64.6%
4703180	01373	Davidson County	*	Tom Joy Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703180	01374	Davidson County	*	Tusculum Elementary	K-4	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01382	Davidson County	*	West End Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703180	01386	Davidson County	*	Whites Creek Comp High Sch	9-12	Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			78.5%	67.5%	64.7%
4703180	01389	Davidson County	*	Wright Middle School	5-8	Restructuring 1	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal					
4700990	01246	DeKalb County	*	Northside Elementary	2-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4700990	00324	DeKalb County	*	Smithville Elementary	PK-2	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4701080	00346	Dyersburg	*	Dyersburg Intermediate Scho	3-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4701080	00349	Dyersburg	*	Dyersburg Primary	PK-2	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4700001	01934	Hamblen County	*	Meadowview Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4701590	00938	Hamilton County	*	Calvin Donaldson Environmen	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4701590	00691	Hamilton County	*	Clifton Hills Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4701590	00704	Hamilton County	*	Dalewood Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4701590	01285	Hamilton County	*	East Lake Academy Of Fine A	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4701590	00502	Hamilton County	*	East Ridge Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4701590	00507	Hamilton County	*	Hamilton County High School	10-12	N<10 - Small School Review	T3					Y	58.9%	27.7%	34.2%
4701590	00757	Hamilton County	*	Hillcrest Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4701590	00781	Hamilton County	*	Lookout Valley Middle / High S	6-12	Corrective Action	T3	Renewal	T3	Focus			81.7%	60.8%	68.3%
4701590	00800	Hamilton County	*	Orchard Knob Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							

Business rules located at end of report.

Highlight BLUE: Originally identified 2009-10

Highlight GREEN: Newly identified 2010-11

TDOE School Improvement Grant Application

Appendix A - Page 5 of 27

**Tennessee TIER 1, 2 and 3 Schools and 2010-11 High Priority Schools**

LEA NCES ID	School NCES ID	District	Title I	School	Grade s	NCLB_Status_2010_11	2010-11 TIER	2010-11 Model	09-10 TIER	09_10 Model	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008
4701590	00517	Hamilton County	*	Red Bank High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			81.6%	75.9%	69.7%
4701590	00795	Hamilton County	*	Rivermont Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4701590	00521	Hamilton County	*	Sequoyah High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			68.6%	63.8%	65.5%
4701590	00812	Hamilton County	*	Tyner Middle Academy	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4701650	00540	Hardeman County	*	Bolivar Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702220	00772	Knox County	*	Beaumont Elementary/Magne	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702220	00773	Knox County	*	Belle Morris Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702220	00725	Knox County	*	Carter High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			82.9%	74.4%	74.0%
4702220	00726	Knox County	*	Carter Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702220	00775	Knox County	*	Central High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			80.2%	70.8%	76.4%
4702220	00473	Knox County	*	Christenberry Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702220	00403	Knox County	*	Dogwood Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702220	00783	Knox County	*	Fulton High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			77.1%	60.0%	43.6%
4702220	00732	Knox County	*	South Doyle High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			80.5%	71.3%	70.6%
4702220	00733	Knox County	*	South Doyle Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702220	00820	Knox County	*	Vine Middle/Magnet	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702220	00825	Knox County	*	Whittle Springs Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702280	00827	Lake County	*	Lara Kendall Elementary	PK-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702310	01970	Lauderdale County	*	Lauderdale Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702310	00549	Lauderdale County	*	Ripley Elementary	3-5	Corrective Action	T3	Renewal	T3	Focus					
4702310	00840	Lauderdale County	*	Ripley Primary	PK-2	Corrective Action	T3	Renewal	T3	Focus					
4702340	00847	Lawrence County	*	Lawrence Co High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus					90.2%	79.9%	76.3%
4702520	00896	Loudon County	*	Greenback School	PK-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			95.2%	93.1%	84.8%
4702550	02115	Macon County	*	Red Boiling Springs Elementa	PK-6	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702580	00649	Madison County	*	Andrew Jackson Elementary	5-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702580	00916	Madison County	*	East Intermediate School	K-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702580	02032	Madison County	*	Liberty Technology Magnet Hi	9-12	Corrective Action - Improving	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			93.7%	92.6%	86.2%
4702940	01013	Memphis	*	Alcy Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	02040	Memphis	*	American Way Middle	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01016	Memphis	*	B T Washington High School	9-12	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	Renewal*	T3	Renewal			81.6%	60.4%	62.8%
4702940	01021	Memphis	*	Brookmeade Elementary	PK-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01030	Memphis	*	Cherokee Elementary	PK-5	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	Renewal*	T3	Renewal					
4702940	01034	Memphis	*	Coleman Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01036	Memphis	*	Colonial Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	02080	Memphis	*	Cordova High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus					79.3%	77.3%	73.8%
4702940	01037	Memphis	*	Corning Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01040	Memphis	*	Craigmont High School	9-12	Corrective Action	T3	Renewal	T3	Focus			86.7%	78.7%	81.3%
4702940	01972	Memphis	*	Dunbar Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01055	Memphis	*	Egypt Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					

Business rules located at end of report.

Highlight BLUE: Originally identified 2009-10

Highlight GREEN: Newly identified 2010-11



### Tennessee TIER 1, 2 and 3 Schools and 2010-11 High Priority Schools

LEA NCES ID	School NCES ID	District	Title I	School	Grade s	NCLB_Status_2010_11	2010-11 TIER	2010-11 Model	09-10 TIER	09_10 Model	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008
4702940	01056	Memphis	*	Evans Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01057	Memphis	*	Fairley Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01058	Memphis	*	Fairley High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus	T3N				68.6%	64.1%	51.4%
4702940	01059	Memphis	*	Fairview Jr High School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01140	Memphis	*	Florida-Kansas Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01063	Memphis	*	Frayser Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01067	Memphis	*	Georgia Ave Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01068	Memphis	*	Georgian Hills Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01605	Memphis	*	Getwell Elementary School	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01075	Memphis	*	Grandview Heights Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01077	Memphis	*	Graves Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01081	Memphis	*	Hamilton Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01082	Memphis	*	Hanley Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01083	Memphis	*	Havenview Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01084	Memphis	*	Hawkins Mill Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	02126	Memphis	*	Kingsbury Middle School	7-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01097	Memphis	*	Knight Road Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	02043	Memphis	*	Lucie E. Campbell Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01115	Memphis	*	Melrose High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus					63.8%	60.5%	66.7%
4702940	01138	Memphis	*	Raleigh Egypt High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus					60.4%	59.7%	69.5%
4702940	01142	Memphis	*	Ridgeway High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus					81.6%	80.2%	82.5%
4702940	01144	Memphis	*	Riverview Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01592	Memphis	*	Ross Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01146	Memphis	*	Scenic Hills Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01152	Memphis	*	Sheffield Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01161	Memphis	*	Spring Hill Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01169	Memphis	*	Vollentine Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4702940	01183	Memphis	*	Whitney Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	02112	Memphis	*	William Herbert Brewster Eler	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4702940	01186	Memphis	*	Wooddale High School	9-12	Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3	Renewal	T3	Renewal			74.2%	64.2%	62.4%
4702970	00464	Milan	*	Milan Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4703000	01201	Monroe County	*	Tellico Plains High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			91.3%	90.6%	77.1%
4703150	01249	Murfreesboro	*	Bradley Academy - An Arts In	K-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703330	01420	Overton County	*	Livingston Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703600	01504	Robertson County	*	Springfield Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4703750	01544	Sequatchie County	*	Sequatchie Co High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			88.9%	79.9%	83.3%
4703750	01546	Sequatchie County	*	Sequatchie Co Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4704230	00047	Unicoi County	*	Unicoi Co Middle School	5-7	School Improvement 1	T3	Focus							
4704290	01362	Union County		Union County Alternative Cen	6-12	N<10	T3								

Business rules located at end of report.

Highlight BLUE: Originally identified 2009-10

Highlight GREEN: Newly identified 2010-11

**Tennessee TIER 1, 2 and 3 Schools and 2010-11 High Priority Schools**

LEA NCES ID	School NCES ID	District	Title I	School	Grade s	NCLB_Status_2010_11	2010-11 TIER	2010-11 Model	09-10 TIER	09_10 Model	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008
4704350	01750	Warren County	*	West Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus					
4704500	01798	White County	*	White County High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	Focus	T3	Focus			88.9%	88.5%	80.1%
4700090	00007	Anderson County		Clinton Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2		Focus		Focus					
4700180	00041	Bedford County		Thomas Magnet	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus					
4700570	00361	Cheatham County		Sycamore Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4700900	00303	Cumberland County		Cumberland County High Sch	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus			89.4%	87.8%	74.3%
4703180	01346	Davidson County		John T. Moore Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 2		Focus	T3	Focus					
4701290	00399	Franklin County		North Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2 - Improving		Focus		Focus					
4701440	00437	Grainger County		Grainger High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving		Focus		Focus			94.8%	89.6%	
4701590	00495	Hamilton County		Central High School	9-12	School Improvement 2		Focus		Focus			82.7%	79.3%	76.9%
4701590	00525	Hamilton County		Soddy Daisy High School	9-12	Corrective Action		Renewal		Focus			87.6%	78.4%	79.2%
4701740	01842	Hawkins County		Cherokee High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving		Focus		Focus			88.5%	83.5%	74.2%
4701980	00641	Humphreys County		Mc Ewen High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus			94.4%	92.5%	78.1%
4702220	00741	Knox County		Gibbs High School	9-12	Corrective Action		Renewal		Focus			83.2%	76.8%	73.6%
4702220	00743	Knox County		Halls High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus			88.0%	88.9%	85.9%
4702640	00936	Marion County		Marion Co High School	9-12	Corrective Action		Renewal		Focus			87.0%	87.1%	90.4%
4702760	00967	Maury County		Culleoka Unit School	PK-12	School Improvement 1		Focus					93.7%	75.3%	78.4%
4702760	00846	Maury County		E. A. Cox Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4702760	01473	Maury County		Mt. Pleasant Middle Visual Pe	5-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4702760	00981	Maury County		Spring Hill High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus			86.5%	81.8%	70.7%
4702760	00982	Maury County		Whitthorne Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4703030	00361	Montgomery County		Kenwood Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus					
4703030	02011	Montgomery County		Northeast Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4703330	01419	Overton County		Livingston Academy	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving		Focus		Focus			91.8%	91.7%	89.4%
4703450	01900	Polk County		Polk County High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus			89.0%	88.0%	79.6%
4703690	01906	Rutherford County		Rock Springs Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4703990	01624	Sullivan County		Sullivan Central High School	9-12	Corrective Action		Renewal		Focus			89.0%	84.6%	86.7%
4703990	01630	Sullivan County		Sullivan East High School	9-12	School Improvement 1		Focus					85.9%	74.1%	75.1%
4704020	01673	Sumner County		Portland East Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4704020	01672	Sumner County		Portland High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving		Focus		Focus			87.9%	86.9%	81.5%
4704020	02048	Sumner County		Station Camp Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4704020	01678	Sumner County		V G Hawkins Middle School	6-8	Corrective Action		Renewal		Focus					
4704200	01712	Tulahoma		East Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							
4704550	01819	Wilson County		Lebanon High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving		Focus		Focus			91.3%	89.5%	82.1%
4704550	01636	Wilson County		Mt. Juliet Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1		Focus							

Business rules located at end of report.

Highlight BLUE: Originally identified 2009-10

Highlight GREEN: Newly identified 2010-11

### Tennessee TIER 1, 2 and 3 Schools and 2010-11 High Priority Schools

LEA NCES ID	School NCES ID	District	Title I	School	Grade s	NCLB_Status_2010_11	2010-11 TIER	2010-11 Model	09-10 TIER	09_10 Model	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008
-------------------	----------------------	----------	------------	--------	------------	---------------------	-----------------	------------------	---------------	----------------	---	--	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

**TIER 1: Persistently Lowest-achieving - Any Title I High Priority school that is either:**

- 1) In the lowest-achieving 5% based on highest numerical Final Rank Index; OR
- 2) Has a graduation rate less than 60% for any 2 of the last 3 years.

**TIER 2: Persistently Lowest-achieving - Any High School eligible for (Low Income Family =>35%) but not "served" by Title I that is either:**

- 1) In the lowest-achieving 5% based on highest numerical Final Rank Index; OR
- 2) Has a graduation rate less than 60% for any 2 of the last 3 years.

**TIER 3: Title I High Priority schools not identified as Tier 1**

Identified schools with N<10 are placed in T3

**Within each tier pool of school, numerical rank index is determined based upon the following series of calculations:**

- 1) The current year math score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest math percent proficient and advanced;
- 2) The current year reading/language arts score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest reading/language arts percent proficient and advanced;
- 3) The math and reading/language arts ranks are summed for current year rank index;
- 4) Two prior years are ranked using the same method;
- 5) Two prior year ranks are averaged for prior years rank index;
- 6) Current year rank index and prior years rank index are summed to create the combined rank index;
- 7) Lastly, five percent of schools with the highest numerical final rank index are identified.

**Notes:**

High priority schools are defined as schools with an improvement status or those in improvement, corrective action, or any form of restructuring as specified in ESEA.

Elementary and secondary schools are weighted equally.

Secondary schools are defined as high schools.

For schools serving both grade spans, high school achievement data is used.

ASD-E: Achievement School District Eligible - Schools in Restructuring 2 or beyond (unless Renewal\*) or Tier 1

Renewal\*: Schools that have moved to Restructuring 2 or beyond (ASD-E) but will be served under Renewal for 3 years

Renewal: Schools in Corrective Action or Restructuring 1

Focus: Schools in School Improvement 1 or School Improvement 2

Business rules located at end of report.

Highlight BLUE: Originally identified 2009-10

Highlight GREEN: Newly identified 2010-11

TDOE School Improvement Grant Application

Appendix A - Page 9 of 27

**2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool**  
**147 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	Title I	School	NCLB_Status_2010_11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Bedford	*	Harris Middle School	6-8 Corrective Action	T3						25.1%	88.9%	87.0%	35.1%	88.7%	91.6%
Carter	*	Hampton Elementary	K-8 School Improvement 1	T3						21.5%	86.4%	88.3%	33.2%	93.9%	89.8%
Cheatham	*	East Cheatham Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 2	T3						28.5%	84.1%	90.5%	29.7%	84.1%	89.3%
Claiborne	*	Tazewell-New Tazewell Elementary	K-4 School Improvement 1	T3						23.4%	87.7%	83.5%	21.3%	86.2%	83.9%
Cleveland	*	Cleveland High School	9-12 School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3			88.1%	89.3%	81.8%	43.2%	72.4%	65.4%	60.7%	95.8%	95.2%
Davidson	*	Amqui Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 2	T3						23.6%	75.5%	79.7%	21.1%	84.3%	82.0%
Davidson	*	Antioch High School	9-12 School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3			82.2%	74.7%	71.5%	26.5%	56.3%	56.0%	43.1%	90.7%	91.0%
Davidson	*	Antioch Middle School	5-8 Restructuring 1	T3						7.8%	79.5%	80.9%	29.8%	85.2%	87.7%
Davidson	*	Apollo Middle School	5-8 Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3						12.1%	83.4%	72.2%	24.4%	84.3%	83.9%
Davidson	*	Bailey Middle School	5-8 School Improvement 2	T3						5.6%	71.1%	72.2%	13.4%	75.4%	78.3%
Davidson	*	Brick Church Middle School	5-8 School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3						6.2%	79.8%	82.3%	17.1%	78.0%	82.4%
Davidson	*	Buena Vista Elementary Enhanced Op	PK-4 School Improvement 1	T3						13.4%	79.4%	74.8%	15.5%	73.8%	86.0%
Davidson	*	Cameron Middle School	5-8 State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T3						11.7%	86.0%	83.3%	19.1%	78.4%	81.2%
Davidson	*	Chadwell Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						32.2%	82.8%	78.7%	41.7%	82.6%	82.8%
Davidson	*	Charlotte Park Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						54.1%	81.8%	81.0%	47.6%	78.0%	80.3%
Davidson	*	Cole Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 1	T3						28.3%	88.3%	81.1%	24.7%	78.4%	84.8%
Davidson	*	Cotton Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						27.1%	77.1%	76.0%	17.1%	79.0%	80.0%
Davidson	*	Dupont Tyler Middle School	5-8 School Improvement 1	T3						22.6%	88.5%	84.9%	36.1%	92.2%	90.7%
Davidson	*	Glenciff Comp High School	9-12 Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3			81.1%	73.3%	66.6%	20.7%	72.8%	71.6%	28.5%	93.7%	87.7%
Davidson	*	Goodlettsville Middle School	5-8 School Improvement 1	T3						20.4%	82.6%	88.9%	32.1%	88.0%	88.6%
Davidson	*	Gra-Mar Middle School	5-8 School Improvement 2	T3						6.0%	71.4%	73.2%	15.6%	75.5%	83.9%
Davidson	*	Isaac Litton Middle School	5-8 School Improvement 2	T3						7.1%	78.9%	69.9%	17.1%	85.0%	82.7%
Davidson	*	Jere Baxter Middle School	5-8 Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3						7.1%	77.8%	78.1%	9.3%	77.7%	80.9%
Davidson	*	John B Whitsitt Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						19.6%	77.8%	71.9%	14.9%	75.0%	80.7%
Davidson	*	John Early Paideia Middle Magnet	5-8 School Improvement 2	T3						5.6%	76.2%	79.2%	9.9%	88.3%	88.2%
Davidson	*	John F. Kennedy Middle School	6-8 School Improvement 1	T3						12.6%	84.1%	81.9%	30.3%	89.9%	88.6%
Davidson	*	Lakeview Elementary Design Center	PK-5 School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						30.2%	87.0%	86.7%	32.9%	87.0%	89.5%
Davidson	*	Margaret Allen Middle School	5-8 Corrective Action	T3						8.2%	82.7%	81.2%	22.0%	84.0%	81.7%
Davidson	*	McGavock Comp High School	9-12 Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3			81.6%	75.8%	76.3%	28.7%	62.2%	52.9%	48.1%	93.1%	95.1%
Davidson	*	Napier Elementary Enhancement Opti	PK-4 School Improvement 2	T1	Y					9.7%	70.5%	58.0%	3.7%	72.5%	70.6%
Davidson	*	Pearl Cohn Magnet High School	9-12 School Improvement 1	T3			80.5%	68.0%	66.1%	18.8%	52.3%	56.2%	13.6%	94.6%	85.6%
Davidson	*	Stratford Comp High School	9-12 School Improvement 2	T3			79.6%	67.6%	64.6%	28.6%	70.4%	71.7%	26.9%	83.3%	77.1%
Davidson	*	Tom Joy Elementary	PK-4 School Improvement 1	T3						29.1%	81.3%	76.4%	24.6%	78.6%	83.5%
Davidson	*	Tusculum Elementary	K-4 School Improvement 2	T3						25.7%	84.5%	78.1%	21.2%	79.2%	73.2%
Davidson	*	West End Middle School	5-8 School Improvement 2	T3						34.3%	86.8%	84.3%	48.3%	88.1%	85.3%
Davidson	*	Whites Creek Comp High School	9-12 Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3			78.5%	67.5%	64.7%	11.6%	43.4%	40.4%	29.5%	86.9%	84.9%
Davidson	*	Wright Middle School	5-8 Restructuring 1	T3						13.9%	87.3%	86.3%	21.8%	86.7%	84.7%
DeKalb	*	Northside Elementary	2-5 School Improvement 1	T3						32.8%	90.1%	94.3%	43.3%	88.1%	91.8%
DeKalb	*	Smithville Elementary	PK-2 School Improvement 1	T3											
Dyersburg	*	Dyersburg Intermediate School	3-5 School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						35.3%	86.2%	86.5%	37.3%	87.0%	88.4%



**2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool**  
**147 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	Title I	School		NCLB_Status_2010_11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Dyersburg	*	Dyersburg Primary	PK-2	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3											
Hamblen	*	Meadowview Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						13.7%	81.0%	83.3%	30.9%	87.5%	88.5%
Hamilton	*	Calvin Donaldson Environmental Scier	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						27.0%	72.0%	75.7%	18.3%	73.5%	74.3%
Hamilton	*	Clifton Hills Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3						17.6%	77.3%	79.5%	13.2%	71.6%	77.0%
Hamilton	*	Dalewood Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						9.1%	71.6%	79.1%	13.0%	75.0%	83.3%
Hamilton	*	East Lake Academy Of Fine Arts	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						10.2%	76.2%	77.4%	13.4%	80.0%	81.7%
Hamilton	*	East Ridge Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3						20.8%	83.0%	86.6%	29.7%	88.2%	89.3%
Hamilton	*	Hillcrest Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3						16.1%	77.8%	79.7%	15.4%	78.5%	85.6%
Hamilton	*	Howard School Of Academics Techno	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Improving	T1		Y	68.6%	56.5%	50.9%	5.7%	40.9%	43.6%	18.8%	93.5%	86.1%
Hamilton	*	Lookout Valley Middle / High School	6-12	Corrective Action	T3			81.7%	60.8%	68.3%	50.9%	76.9%	74.1%	49.1%	96.3%	94.4%
Hamilton	*	Orchard Knob Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3						19.3%	70.1%	83.6%	16.4%	71.3%	76.9%
Hamilton	*	Orchard Knob Middle	6-8	School Improvement 2	T1	Y					6.9%	65.1%	66.3%	10.5%	65.2%	67.1%
Hamilton	*	Red Bank High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T3			81.6%	75.9%	69.7%	7.7%	60.5%	60.7%	48.4%	91.7%	96.5%
Hamilton	*	Rivermont Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3						25.4%	75.3%	84.4%	20.4%	80.2%	90.0%
Hamilton	*	Sequoyah High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T3			68.6%	63.8%	65.5%	23.7%	62.3%	39.7%	32.0%	94.4%	95.3%
Hamilton	*	Tyner Middle Academy	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						12.4%	87.0%	88.6%	20.5%	88.1%	90.5%
Hardeman	*	Bolivar Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						16.0%	88.0%	87.3%	28.7%	88.2%	87.9%
Knox	*	Austin East High/Magnet	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Improving	T3			85.4%	74.9%	75.2%	18.0%	48.3%	68.2%	30.9%	83.6%	85.3%
Knox	*	Beaumont Elementary/Magnet	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						38.7%	76.6%	74.0%	35.8%	74.0%	76.7%
Knox	*	Belle Morris Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3						35.8%	82.7%	82.1%	30.2%	81.1%	79.2%
Knox	*	Carter High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3			82.9%	74.4%	74.0%	38.1%	70.3%	69.6%	66.4%	97.9%	94.0%
Knox	*	Carter Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						18.6%	83.5%	85.5%	40.7%	89.8%	92.2%
Knox	*	Central High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3			80.2%	70.8%	76.4%	25.0%	83.1%	80.8%	60.7%	91.5%	94.8%
Knox	*	Christenberry Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						26.1%	83.8%	85.6%	20.9%	81.1%	81.2%
Knox	*	Dogwood Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1	T3						33.3%	83.8%	86.8%	23.6%	79.6%	85.0%
Knox	*	Fulton High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3			77.1%	60.0%	43.6%	22.8%	65.2%	66.5%	48.2%	93.2%	91.8%
Knox	*	South Doyle High School	9-12	Restructuring 1	T3			80.5%	71.3%	70.6%	36.2%	76.9%	72.0%	58.6%	96.0%	88.7%
Knox	*	South Doyle Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						22.1%	87.1%	84.9%	41.4%	87.4%	91.0%
Knox	*	Vine Middle/Magnet	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						12.4%	75.4%	77.8%	20.1%	69.2%	81.5%
Knox	*	Whittle Springs Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						20.0%	82.3%	84.4%	28.6%	83.6%	85.4%
Lake	*	Lara Kendall Elementary	PK-8	School Improvement 1	T3						22.7%	88.1%	90.5%	28.3%	87.2%	88.1%
Lauderdale	*	Lauderdale Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3						13.6%	90.6%	90.2%	38.4%	94.5%	94.6%
Lauderdale	*	Ripley Elementary	3-5	Corrective Action	T3						17.9%	85.1%	81.4%	23.1%	82.7%	90.0%
Lauderdale	*	Ripley Primary	PK-2	Corrective Action	T3											
Lawrence	*	Lawrence Co High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3			90.2%	79.9%	76.3%	39.5%	87.9%	87.5%	57.8%	96.9%	99.0%
Loudon	*	Greenback School	PK-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3			95.2%	93.1%	84.8%	88.1%	79.5%	70.7%	79.2%	100.0%	100.0%
Macon	*	Red Boiling Springs Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						24.1%	81.9%	84.4%	36.1%	85.3%	82.8%
Madison	*	Andrew Jackson Elementary School	5-6	School Improvement 1	T3						15.5%	80.5%	84.7%	27.2%	87.3%	89.8%
Madison	*	East Intermediate School	K-5	School Improvement 1	T3						28.0%	83.6%	86.5%	38.5%	87.6%	94.1%
Madison	*	Jackson Central-Merry Academy of Me	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T3			81.5%	63.4%	57.2%	22.0%	70.8%	68.7%	23.4%	93.3%	89.8%

**2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool**  
**147 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	Title I	School	NCLB_Status_2010_11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Madison	*	Liberty Technology Magnet High School	9-12	Corrective Action - Improving	T3		93.7%	92.6%	86.2%	46.0%	75.0%	82.9%	47.2%	96.2%	98.0%
Memphis	*	Alcy Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3					16.0%	82.4%	78.5%	10.1%	77.6%	81.6%
Memphis	*	American Way Middle	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3					6.9%	80.0%	81.9%	15.8%	80.5%	83.3%
Memphis	*	B T Washington High School	9-12	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3		81.6%	60.4%	62.8%	36.6%	69.2%	64.9%	27.6%	83.9%	83.5%
Memphis	*	Brookmeade Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3					15.5%	80.9%	77.4%	17.1%	67.4%	83.2%
Memphis	*	Cherokee Elementary	PK-5	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3					14.1%	76.6%	63.1%	10.8%	65.1%	63.5%
Memphis	*	Coleman Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3					10.7%	77.0%	69.7%	11.7%	72.5%	82.9%
Memphis	*	Colonial Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3					13.5%	87.8%	89.6%	37.7%	91.5%	94.6%
Memphis	*	Cordova High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3		79.3%	77.3%	73.8%	30.2%	73.4%	67.9%	54.2%	96.4%	96.7%
Memphis	*	Corning Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3					8.9%	80.5%	77.8%	10.8%	75.9%	85.7%
Memphis	*	Craigmont High School	9-12	Corrective Action	T3		86.7%	78.7%	81.3%	21.0%	61.3%	59.5%	43.1%	91.7%	86.4%
Memphis	*	Cypress Middle School	6-8	Corrective Action	T1	Y				5.7%	74.7%	75.3%	11.4%	71.9%	73.4%
Memphis	*	Dunbar Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3					17.6%	83.5%	81.0%	12.0%	71.7%	81.7%
Memphis	*	Egypt Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3					12.6%	82.9%	75.3%	11.3%	79.9%	80.1%
Memphis	*	Evans Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3					22.8%	85.9%	85.5%	29.6%	84.2%	87.5%
Memphis	*	Fairley Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3					14.9%	75.7%	73.7%	13.7%	65.1%	78.4%
Memphis	*	Fairley High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3		68.6%	64.1%	51.4%	6.2%	44.1%	34.4%	17.6%	88.0%	87.2%
Memphis	*	Fairview Jr High School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3					4.8%	72.0%	70.7%	11.7%	78.2%	81.8%
Memphis	*	Florida-Kansas Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3					11.6%	80.2%	77.8%	15.5%	75.0%	87.2%
Memphis	*	Ford Road Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T1	Y				5.7%	66.8%	70.1%	9.6%	61.1%	74.2%
Memphis	*	Frayser Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3					9.1%	73.5%	76.5%	10.5%	64.4%	78.7%
Memphis	*	Frayser High School	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 2 - Improving	T1	Y	66.1%	56.3%	54.8%	11.8%	52.8%	37.0%	14.5%	91.7%	90.2%
Memphis	*	Georgia Ave Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 2	T3					8.4%	77.7%	80.0%	9.7%	72.5%	79.5%
Memphis	*	Georgian Hills Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3					13.8%	67.5%	68.0%	11.9%	69.7%	77.6%
Memphis	*	Getwell Elementary School	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3					28.9%	88.8%	75.8%	26.7%	83.8%	81.9%
Memphis	*	Grandview Heights Elementary School	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3					12.4%	73.9%	74.8%	10.0%	66.3%	82.0%
Memphis	*	Graves Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3					8.7%	81.2%	72.1%	13.5%	72.8%	82.6%
Memphis	*	Hamilton High School	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 4	T1	Y	56.5%	46.4%	54.6%	4.5%	45.4%	34.5%	15.8%	95.7%	80.5%
Memphis	*	Hamilton Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 2	T3					5.1%	77.7%	78.3%	8.1%	75.5%	83.5%
Memphis	*	Hanley Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3					14.6%	80.7%	64.3%	16.1%	73.4%	81.7%
Memphis	*	Havenview Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3					6.3%	81.6%	79.6%	14.5%	82.6%	88.3%
Memphis	*	Hawkins Mill Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3					18.5%	80.4%	75.2%	14.7%	79.0%	83.7%
Memphis	*	Hillcrest High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T1	Y	58.8%	58.6%	64.5%	4.4%	49.7%	46.0%	18.5%	85.7%	81.2%
Memphis	*	Kingsbury High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T1	Y	68.2%	53.1%	57.8%	23.0%	74.2%	55.0%	33.3%	83.6%	89.7%
Memphis	*	Kingsbury Middle School	7-8	School Improvement 1	T3					8.6%	84.0%	82.7%	19.1%	84.8%	82.1%
Memphis	*	Knight Road Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3					19.4%	85.4%	84.0%	17.1%	80.2%	86.3%
Memphis	*	Lester Elementary School	PK-6	School Improvement 2	T1	Y				3.4%	63.4%	66.8%	5.0%	60.6%	69.8%
Memphis	*	Lucie E. Campbell Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3					14.8%	78.4%	70.7%	15.6%	71.0%	81.2%
Memphis	*	Manassas High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T1	Y	65.0%	54.8%	50.8%	5.5%	24.9%	33.5%	16.3%	82.4%	74.6%
Memphis	*	Melrose High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3		63.8%	60.5%	66.7%	2.7%	45.6%	47.6%	16.7%	87.3%	83.2%

**2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool**  
**147 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	Title I	School		NCLB_Status_2010_11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Memphis	*	Northside High School	9-12	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Improving	T1		Y	52.5%	44.2%	50.4%	17.1%	39.4%	44.9%	16.0%	83.8%	83.8%
Memphis	*	Raleigh Egypt High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3			60.4%	59.7%	69.5%	9.9%	51.3%	54.4%	18.3%	90.6%	90.5%
Memphis	*	Raleigh Egypt Middle School	6-8	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T1	Y					6.2%	72.5%	76.8%	8.9%	70.6%	76.7%
Memphis	*	Ridgeway High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T3			81.6%	80.2%	82.5%	22.3%	62.8%	61.3%	49.5%	98.3%	95.9%
Memphis	*	Riverview Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						3.6%	76.2%	79.4%	7.5%	70.6%	83.3%
Memphis	*	Ross Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						17.6%	87.4%	79.4%	22.1%	81.5%	85.5%
Memphis	*	Scenic Hills Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3						14.3%	85.8%	76.4%	14.3%	80.1%	87.5%
Memphis	*	Sheffield Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3						20.1%	77.3%	85.7%	13.4%	73.4%	87.0%
Memphis	*	Sheffield High School	9-12	Corrective Action	T1		Y	72.0%	47.3%	53.6%	12.1%	56.7%	55.6%	25.5%	83.7%	80.4%
Memphis	*	Sherwood Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T1	Y					1.7%	71.7%	78.2%	9.6%	71.2%	83.9%
Memphis	*	Spring Hill Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3						15.3%	71.0%	75.5%	17.3%	66.0%	84.1%
Memphis	*	Trezevant High School	9-12	School Improvement 1	T1		Y	66.1%	52.4%	56.6%	22.1%	47.3%	40.7%	16.7%	78.2%	76.4%
Memphis	*	Vollentine Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						22.0%	74.1%	75.6%	17.2%	68.7%	78.7%
Memphis	*	Westside Middle	7-8	School Improvement 1	T1	Y					2.1%	77.4%	71.7%	7.5%	75.1%	77.6%
Memphis	*	Whitney Elementary	PK-6	School Improvement 1	T3						13.9%	80.3%	78.9%	15.2%	76.1%	84.7%
Memphis	*	William Herbert Brewster Elementary	PK-5	School Improvement 1	T3						15.5%	74.7%	73.7%	16.2%	71.4%	82.5%
Memphis	*	Wooddale High School	9-12	Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3			74.2%	64.2%	62.4%	8.4%	50.2%	52.3%	22.0%	87.4%	87.8%
Milan	*	Milan Elementary	PK-4	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						49.3%	88.5%	88.3%	43.8%	89.4%	93.7%
Monroe	*	Tellico Plains High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3			91.3%	90.6%	77.1%	37.1%	79.3%	64.8%	59.4%	92.8%	91.4%
Murfreesboro	*	Bradley Academy - An Arts Integrated	K-6	School Improvement 1	T3						15.6%	88.7%	83.9%	26.4%	85.9%	86.4%
Overton	*	Livingston Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1	T3						19.9%	89.9%	94.1%	46.1%	91.4%	94.3%
Robertson	*	Springfield Middle School	6-8	School Improvement 1	T3						16.3%	83.4%	87.0%	27.9%	83.9%	88.5%
Sequatchie	*	Sequatchie Co High School	9-12	School Improvement 2	T3			88.9%	79.9%	83.3%	32.7%	76.8%	85.7%	66.9%	98.7%	96.2%
Sequatchie	*	Sequatchie Co Middle School	5-8	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						30.4%	92.7%	92.6%	44.9%	91.8%	92.5%
Unicoi	*	Unicoi Co Middle School	5-7	School Improvement 1	T3						22.8%	91.3%	92.2%	44.6%	92.8%	94.3%
Warren	*	West Elementary	K-5	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3						29.6%	84.9%	85.8%	33.8%	86.0%	84.4%
White	*	White County High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3			88.9%	88.5%	80.1%	47.4%	85.2%	67.5%	61.8%	98.2%	97.6%



## 2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool

### 147 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB_Status_2010_11	TIER	SIG & FTTT RANK	Final RANK INDEX	Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Bedford	Harris Middle School	Corrective Action	T3	14	116.5	116.5	42.5	74	43	42	38	6	16	36	37	26
Carter	Hampton Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	21	138	138	44	94	39	49	55	23	11	39	16	38
Cheatham	East Cheatham Elementary	School Improvement 2	T3	25	152.5	152.5	74.5	78	101	48	29	33	6	49	68	42
Claiborne	Tazewell-New Tazewell Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	41	211.5	211.5	95.5	116	73	118	43	16	38	73	57	80
Cleveland	Cleveland High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	18	134	134	121	13	116	126	7	105	116	6	11	10
Davidson	Amqui Elementary	School Improvement 2	T3	63	273.5	273.5	156.5	117	157	156	42	92	55	75	65	101
Davidson	Antioch High School	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	44	217.5	217.5	158.5	59	162	155	34	130	126	25	32	29
Davidson	Antioch Middle School	Restructuring 1	T3	66	283	283	117	166	129	105	119	67	52	47	62	53
Davidson	Apollo Middle School	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	69	308.5	308.5	141.5	167	107	176	102	41	94	65	66	82
Davidson	Bailey Middle School	School Improvement 2	T3	122	471	471	220	251	220	220	134	111	93	117	109	127
Davidson	Brick Church Middle School	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	91	370	370	155	215	168	142	126	66	43	89	102	99
Davidson	Buena Vista Elementary Enhanced Op	School Improvement 1	T3	89	367.5	367.5	166.5	201	182	151	95	69	87	106	113	64
Davidson	Cameron Middle School	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T3	73	321.5	321.5	136.5	185	122	151	104	25	39	81	97	112
Davidson	Chadwell Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	34	188	188	142	46	125	159	20	46	64	26	79	95
Davidson	Charlotte Park Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	31	180.5	180.5	161.5	19	154	169	2	53	51	17	101	118
Davidson	Cole Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	40	209	209	116	93	109	123	30	11	49	63	98	74
Davidson	Cotton Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	70	311.5	311.5	186.5	125	175	198	32	81	78	93	94	120
Davidson	Dupont Tyler Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	17	129	129	46	83	33	59	49	9	29	34	24	30
Davidson	Glenclyff Comp High School	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	57	249	249	137	112	120	154	58	103	100	54	17	54
Davidson	Goodlettsville Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	29	162.5	162.5	62.5	100	93	32	59	49	9	41	44	23
Davidson	Gra-Mar Middle School	School Improvement 2	T3	109	427	427	194	233	217	171	129	110	92	104	107	79
Davidson	Isaac Litton Middle School	School Improvement 2	T3	95	380.5	380.5	167.5	213	134	201	122	71	105	91	63	96
Davidson	Jere Baxter Middle School	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	112	439	439	180	259	177	183	121	74	69	138	103	114
Davidson	John B Whitsitt Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	91	370	370	198	172	184	212	63	73	97	109	111	115
Davidson	John Early Paideia Middle Magnet	School Improvement 2	T3	98	386	386	119	267	128	110	133	90	61	134	38	49
Davidson	John F. Kennedy Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	45	220.5	220.5	78.5	142	68	89	97	34	45	45	34	44
Davidson	Lakeview Elementary Design Center	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	17	129	129	66	63	74	58	23	21	18	40	53	40
Davidson	Margaret Allen Middle School	Corrective Action	T3	75	325	325	136	189	117	155	118	48	48	71	69	107
Davidson	McGavock Comp High School	Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3	33	187	187	144	43	147	141	27	126	130	16	21	11
Davidson	Napier Elementary Enhancement Opti	School Improvement 2	T1	128	502.5	502.5	248.5	254	233	264	110	114	124	144	119	140
Davidson	Pearl Cohn Magnet High School	School Improvement 1	T3	79	349	349	168	181	145	191	66	132	125	115	13	66
Davidson	Stratford Comp High School	School Improvement 2	T3	67	297	297	210	87	192	228	28	115	98	59	77	130
Davidson	Tom Joy Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	54	245.5	245.5	156.5	89	150	163	25	55	77	64	95	86
Davidson	Tusculum Elementary	School Improvement 2	T3	65	275.5	275.5	165.5	110	124	207	36	32	68	74	92	139
Davidson	West End Middle School	School Improvement 2	T3	13	114	114	84	30	64	104	16	22	34	14	42	70
Davidson	Whites Creek Comp High School	Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3	85	359	359	203	156	196	210	105	141	137	51	55	73
Davidson	Wright Middle School	Restructuring 1	T3	55	247.5	247.5	85.5	162	74	97	90	18	22	72	56	75
DeKalb	Northside Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	4	77	77	36	41	47	25	18	4	1	23	43	24
DeKalb	Smithville Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dyersburg	Dyersburg Intermediate School	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	15	119.5	119.5	72.5	47	78	67	15	24	20	32	54	47

## 2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool

### 147 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB Status 2010_11	TIER	SIG & FTTT RANK	Final RANK INDEX	Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Dyersburg	Dyersburg Primary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hamblen	Meadowview Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	50	230	230	95	135	104	86	92	57	40	43	47	46
Hamilton	Calvin Donaldson Environmental Scier	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	77	336.5	336.5	218.5	118	221	216	33	107	80	85	114	136
Hamilton	Clifton Hills Elementary	School Improvement 2	T3	99	387	387	196	191	203	189	71	80	58	120	123	131
Hamilton	Dalewood Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	107	417.5	417.5	185.5	232	220	151	111	109	62	121	111	89
Hamilton	East Lake Academy Of Fine Arts	School Improvement 1	T3	104	405.5	405.5	178.5	227	177	180	108	88	72	119	89	108
Hamilton	East Ridge Middle School	School Improvement 2	T3	30	176.5	176.5	71.5	105	83	60	57	44	19	48	39	41
Hamilton	Hillcrest Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	76	330	330	147	183	171	123	76	75	56	107	96	67
Hamilton	Howard School Of Academics Techno	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Improving	T1	102	393	393	179	214	160	198	132	142	135	82	18	63
Hamilton	Lookout Valley Middle / High School	Corrective Action	T3	11	112	112	97	15	91	103	3	83	88	12	8	15
Hamilton	Orchard Knob Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	88	366.5	366.5	205.5	161	242	169	65	117	37	96	125	132
Hamilton	Orchard Knob Middle	School Improvement 2	T1	129	511	511	257	254	257	257	124	122	115	130	135	142
Hamilton	Red Bank High School	School Improvement 2	T3	64	275	275	142	133	156	128	120	128	122	13	28	6
Hamilton	Rivemont Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	52	238.5	238.5	123.5	115	180	67	37	94	33	78	86	34
Hamilton	Sequoyah High School	School Improvement 2	T3	47	226.5	226.5	143.5	83	140	147	41	125	138	42	15	9
Hamilton	Tyner Middle Academy	School Improvement 1	T3	49	228.5	228.5	51.5	177	61	42	100	20	10	77	41	32
Hardeman	Bolivar Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	34	188	188	59	129	53	65	77	13	14	52	40	51
Knox	Austin East High/Magnet	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Improving	T3	68	308	308	195	113	210	180	69	136	109	44	74	71
Knox	Beaumont Elementary/Magnet	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	59	254	254	210	44	198	222	9	86	89	35	112	133
Knox	Belle Morris Elementary	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	39	208.5	208.5	148.5	60	131	166	14	47	44	46	84	122
Knox	Carter High School	Restructuring 1	T3	19	136.5	136.5	123.5	13	121	126	10	116	107	3	5	19
Knox	Carter Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	27	156	156	61	95	74	48	67	39	26	28	35	22
Knox	Central High School	Restructuring 1	T3	12	113	113	69	44	73	65	39	43	53	5	30	12
Knox	Christenberry Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	53	239.5	239.5	128.5	111	119	138	35	36	25	76	83	113
Knox	Dogwood Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	36	191.5	191.5	108.5	83	128	89	17	37	17	66	91	72
Knox	Fulton High School	Restructuring 1	T3	38	200	200	140	60	141	139	45	121	114	15	20	25
Knox	South Doyle High School	Restructuring 1	T3	20	137.5	137.5	116.5	21	94	139	13	84	96	8	10	43
Knox	South Doyle Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	22	141	141	62	79	68	56	52	19	28	27	49	28
Knox	Vine Middle/Magnet	School Improvement 1	T3	94	379	379	202	177	223	181	98	93	71	79	130	110
Knox	Whittle Springs Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	48	227.5	227.5	113.5	114	127	100	61	51	31	53	76	69
Lake	Lara Kendall Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	29	162.5	162.5	59.5	103	64	55	48	12	5	55	52	50
Lauderdale	Lauderdale Middle School	School Improvement 2	T3	23	142	142	19	123	17	21	93	3	7	30	14	14
Lauderdale	Ripley Elementary	Corrective Action	T3	51	233	233	95	138	108	82	70	30	47	68	78	35
Lauderdale	Ripley Primary	Corrective Action	T3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lawrence	Lawrence Co High School	School Improvement 1	T3	1	34.5	34.5	17.5	17	20	15	8	14	13	9	6	2
Loudon	Greenback School	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	7	88.5	88.5	86.5	2	69	104	1	68	103	1	1	1
Macon	Red Boiling Springs Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	37	192.5	192.5	119.5	73	113	126	40	52	32	33	61	94
Madison	Andrew Jackson Elementary School	School Improvement 1	T3	47	226.5	226.5	88.5	138	111	66	80	60	30	58	51	36
Madison	East Intermediate School	School Improvement 1	T3	16	121.5	121.5	61.5	60	84	39	31	38	21	29	46	18
Madison	Jackson Central-Merry Academy of Me	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T3	60	258.5	258.5	138.5	120	132	145	53	113	108	67	19	37

## 2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool

### 147 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB Status 2010_11	TIER	SIG & FTTT RANK	Final RANK INDEX	Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Madison	Liberty Technology Magnet High School	Corrective Action - Improving	T3	9	98	98	74	24	104	44	6	95	41	18	9	3
Memphis	Alcy Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	93	374	374	164	210	154	174	78	50	65	132	104	109
Memphis	American Way Middle	School Improvement 1	T3	87	366	366	142	224	150	134	123	65	46	101	85	88
Memphis	B T Washington High School	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	62	265.5	265.5	196.5	69	189	204	12	118	117	57	71	87
Memphis	Brookmeade Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	80	349.5	349.5	177.5	172	190	165	82	58	73	90	132	92
Memphis	Cherokee Elementary	Restructuring 2 (Alt. Governance)	T3	118	460	460	243	217	223	263	88	87	120	129	136	143
Memphis	Coleman Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	110	432.5	432.5	200.5	232	202	199	107	82	106	125	120	93
Memphis	Colonial Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	28	157.5	157.5	32.5	125	44	21	94	15	8	31	29	13
Memphis	Cordova High School	School Improvement 1	T3	24	144.5	144.5	112.5	32	109	116	22	102	111	10	7	5
Memphis	Corning Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	101	392	392	151	241	167	135	113	61	70	128	106	65
Memphis	Craigmont High School	Corrective Action	T3	56	248	248	168	80	153	183	56	127	123	24	26	60
Memphis	Cypress Middle School	Corrective Action	T1	124	476	476	219	257	217	221	131	96	83	126	121	138
Memphis	Dunbar Elementary	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	82	354	354	159	195	162	156	73	40	50	122	122	106
Memphis	Egypt Elementary	School Improvement 2	T3	101	392	392	169	223	135	203	96	45	84	127	90	119
Memphis	Evans Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	32	184.5	184.5	87.5	97	93	82	47	26	27	50	67	55
Memphis	Fairley Elementary	School Improvement 2	T3	108	419.5	419.5	221.5	198	228	215	84	91	90	114	137	125
Memphis	Fairley High School	School Improvement 1	T3	105	406	406	192	214	185	199	128	140	141	86	45	58
Memphis	Fairview Jr High School	School Improvement 2	T3	121	466.5	466.5	205.5	261	206	205	137	106	101	124	100	104
Memphis	Florida-Kansas Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	86	362.5	362.5	151.5	211	175	128	106	64	71	105	111	57
Memphis	Ford Road Elementary	School Improvement 1	T1	130	516	516	250	266	259	241	130	120	104	136	139	137
Memphis	Frayser Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	119	462	462	219	243	239	199	112	101	75	131	138	124
Memphis	Frayser High School	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 2 - Improving	T1	94	379	379	165	214	158	172	103	131	139	111	27	33
Memphis	Georgia Ave Elementary	School Improvement 2	T3	111	436.5	436.5	184.5	252	194	175	117	76	54	135	118	121
Memphis	Georgian Hills Elementary	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T3	117	457	457	243	214	248	238	91	119	110	123	129	128
Memphis	Getwell Elementary School	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	42	216.5	216.5	130.5	86	79	182	26	7	79	60	72	103
Memphis	Grandview Heights Elementary School	School Improvement 1	T3	114	442.5	442.5	210.5	232	233	188	99	100	86	133	133	102
Memphis	Graves Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	106	412.5	412.5	182.5	230	173	192	114	56	95	116	117	97
Memphis	Hamilton High School	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 4	T1	115	443.5	443.5	203.5	240	151	256	138	139	140	102	12	116
Memphis	Hamilton Middle School	School Improvement 2	T3	116	444	444	168	276	185	151	136	77	66	140	108	85
Memphis	Hanley Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	97	384.5	384.5	199.5	185	175	224	86	59	119	99	116	105
Memphis	Havenview Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	84	356.5	356.5	119.5	237	134	105	125	54	57	112	80	48
Memphis	Hawkins Mill Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	78	340	340	162	178	155	169	68	62	85	110	93	84
Memphis	Hillcrest High School	School Improvement 1	T1	113	442	442	220	222	195	245	139	135	133	83	60	112
Memphis	Kingsbury High School	School Improvement 2	T1	58	252	252	170	82	173	167	44	98	128	38	75	39
Memphis	Kingsbury Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	71	315.5	315.5	120.5	195	99	142	115	35	42	80	64	100
Memphis	Knight Road Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	61	262	262	106	156	115	97	64	28	35	92	87	62
Memphis	Lester Elementary School	School Improvement 2	T1	131	542.5	542.5	258.5	284	263	254	141	123	113	143	140	141
Memphis	Lucie E. Campbell Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	103	394	394	206	188	199	213	85	72	102	103	127	111
Memphis	Manassas High School	School Improvement 2 - Improving	T1	125	483	483	251	232	225	277	135	144	142	97	81	135
Memphis	Melrose High School	School Improvement 1	T3	114	442.5	442.5	205.5	237	188	223	142	138	132	95	50	91



## 2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool

### 147 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB_Status_2010_11	TIER	SIG & FTTT RANK	Final RANK INDEX	Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Memphis	Northside High School	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1 - Improving	T1	100	390	390	216	174	215	217	74	143	134	100	72	83
Memphis	Raleigh Egypt High School	School Improvement 1	T3	83	356	356	163	193	166	160	109	133	129	84	33	31
Memphis	Raleigh Egypt Middle School	State/LEA Reconstitution Plan 1	T1	126	486	486	220	266	232	208	127	104	74	139	128	134
Memphis	Ridgeway High School	School Improvement 1	T3	35	189	189	128	61	127	129	50	124	121	11	3	8
Memphis	Riverview Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	120	464.5	464.5	183.5	281	217	150	140	89	60	141	128	90
Memphis	Ross Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	59	254	254	113	141	99	127	72	17	59	69	82	68
Memphis	Scenic Hills Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	74	323.5	323.5	123.5	200	115	132	87	27	76	113	88	56
Memphis	Sheffield Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	72	316.5	316.5	138.5	178	194	83	60	79	24	118	115	59
Memphis	Sheffield High School	Corrective Action	T1	98	386	386	223	163	202	244	101	129	127	62	73	117
Memphis	Sherwood Middle School	School Improvement 1	T1	123	472	472	191	281	234	148	144	108	67	137	126	81
Memphis	Spring Hill Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	92	373	373	203	170	246	160	83	112	82	87	134	78
Memphis	Trezevant High School	School Improvement 1	T1	103	394	394	249	145	236	262	51	137	136	94	99	126
Memphis	Vollentine Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	85	359	359	217	142	230	204	54	99	81	88	131	123
Memphis	Westside Middle	School Improvement 1	T1	127	493	493	208	285	188	228	143	78	99	142	110	129
Memphis	Whitney Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	81	350.5	350.5	153.5	197	168	139	89	63	63	108	105	76
Memphis	William Herbert Brewster Elementary	School Improvement 1	T3	96	384	384	205	179	221	189	81	97	91	98	124	98
Memphis	Wooddale High School	Restructuring 1 - Improving	T3	90	368.5	368.5	182.5	186	182	183	116	134	131	70	48	52
Milan	Milan Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	2	65	65	39	26	46	32	4	10	12	22	36	20
Monroe	Tellico Plains High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	19	136.5	136.5	118.5	18	92	145	11	70	118	7	22	27
Murfreesboro	Bradley Academy - An Arts Integrated	School Improvement 1	T3	46	222	222	82	140	67	97	79	8	36	61	59	61
Overton	Livingston Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	10	108	108	27	81	36	18	62	5	2	19	31	16
Robertson	Springfield Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	43	217	217	86	131	112	60	75	42	15	56	70	45
Sequatchie	Sequatchie Co High School	School Improvement 2	T3	5	80	80	59	21	87	31	19	85	24	2	2	7
Sequatchie	Sequatchie Co Middle School	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	3	66	66	25	41	26	24	21	1	3	20	25	21
Unicoi	Unicoi Co Middle School	School Improvement 1	T3	8	90	90	23	67	25	21	46	2	4	21	23	17
Warren	West Elementary	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	26	155.5	155.5	94.5	61	89	100	24	31	23	37	58	77
White	White County High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T3	6	83.5	83.5	74.5	9	33	116	5	29	112	4	4	4

## 2010-11 Tier 1 Selection Pool

### 147 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB_Status_2010_11	TIER	SIG & FTTT RANK	Final RANK INDEX	Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
----------	--------	---------------------	------	-----------------	------------------	---------------------	------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

**TIER 1: Persistently Lowest-achieving - Any Title I High Priority school that is either:**

- 1) In the lowest-achieving 5% based on highest numerical Final Rank Index; OR
- 2) Has a graduation rate less than 60% for any 2 of the last 3 years.

**TIER 2: Persistently Lowest-achieving - Any High School eligible for (Low Income Family =>35%) but not "served" by Title I that is either:**

- 1) In the lowest-achieving 5% based on highest numerical Final Rank Index; OR
- 2) Has a graduation rate less than 60% for any 2 of the last 3 years.

**TIER 3: Title I High Priority schools not identified as Tier 1**

Identified schools with N<10 are placed in T3

**When determining Tiers, the USDOE allows percentages for Every Test Taker (ETT) in the ALL subgroup to be used and not AYP data.**

Math %P/A: Percent proficient/advanced for ETT ~ K8: TCAP 3-8 Math & HS: Algebra I assessments.

RLA %P/A: Percent proficient/advanced for ETT ~ K8: TCAP 3-8 Reading/Language Arts (RLA) & HS: English II assessments.

Tier 1 selection pool includes 147 schools

Tier 2 selection pool includes 134 schools

**Within each tier pool of school, numerical rank index is determined based upon the following series of calculations:**

- 1) The current year math score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest math percent proficient and advanced;
- 2) The current year reading/language arts score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest reading/language arts percent proficient and advanced;
- 3) The math and reading/language arts ranks are summed for current year rank index;
- 4) Two prior years are ranked using the same method;
- 5) Two prior year ranks are averaged for prior years rank index;
- 6) Current year rank index and prior years rank index are summed to create the combined rank index;
- 7) Lastly, five percent of schools with the highest numerical final rank index are identified.

#### Notes:

High priority schools are defined as schools with an improvement status or those in improvement, corrective action, or any form of restructuring as specified in ESEA.

Elementary and secondary schools are weighted equally.

Secondary schools are defined as high schools.

For schools serving both grade spans, high school achievement data is used.



**2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool**  
**134 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	School		NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Alcoa	Alcoa High School	9-12	Good Standing				95.7%	95.9%	90.5%	57.7%	90.8%	88.0%	78.1%	97.3%	99.3%
Anderson	Anderson County High School	9-12	Good Standing				94.4%	91.4%	89.9%	53.4%	79.0%	84.8%	52.8%	98.7%	95.8%
Anderson	Clinton High School	9-12	Good Standing				88.5%	81.8%	80.9%	39.1%	73.2%	74.3%	58.0%	96.0%	97.2%
Bedford	Cascade School	6-12	Target				90.4%	91.7%	84.7%	52.3%	80.2%	77.0%	61.0%	99.0%	90.1%
Bedford	Central High School	9-12	Target				74.2%	81.1%	89.5%	51.9%	75.2%	74.7%	61.5%	99.3%	96.2%
Bedford	Community High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		84.3%	86.3%	84.2%	26.7%	76.6%	76.2%	57.0%	94.4%	90.6%
Benton	Camden Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				89.2%	91.6%	90.4%	47.2%	78.1%	78.4%	62.5%	94.1%	93.8%
Blount	Heritage High School	9-12	Good Standing				90.8%	88.2%	81.2%	45.4%	77.7%	76.4%	61.4%	95.7%	97.7%
Blount	William Blount High School	9-12	Target				90.2%	93.7%	88.6%	39.7%	82.9%	85.8%	58.4%	96.5%	97.2%
Bradley	Bradley Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				82.8%	87.8%	77.6%	33.7%	74.3%	79.0%	54.3%	91.4%	92.0%
Bradley	Walker Valley High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.9%	88.8%	89.8%	45.0%	79.1%	82.0%	68.2%	95.3%	92.9%
Bristol	Tennessee High School	9-12	Good Standing				94.4%	88.4%	87.1%	61.4%	93.2%	84.4%	78.1%	98.6%	95.0%
Cannon	Cannon County High School	9-12	Target				87.0%	72.7%	83.5%	28.5%	73.2%	74.3%	49.0%	97.2%	99.5%
Cheatham	Cheatham Co Central	9-12	Target				81.7%	86.5%	91.7%	33.3%	82.1%	89.1%	60.7%	94.2%	96.4%
Cheatham	Sycamore High School	9-12	Good Standing				89.7%	95.4%	93.3%	37.5%	87.0%	85.6%	68.8%	97.7%	96.6%
Chester	Chester County High School	9-12	Good Standing				86.2%	93.1%	88.1%	30.9%	68.1%	67.5%	57.7%	96.8%	95.8%
Coffee	Coffee County Central High School	9-12	Target				83.6%	86.3%	82.9%	39.6%	84.6%	74.2%	57.6%	97.2%	95.6%
Crockett	Crockett County High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.1%	96.5%	92.1%	28.9%	86.8%	91.6%	52.7%	99.1%	96.2%
Cumberland	Cumberland County High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving				89.4%	87.8%	74.3%	53.0%	87.6%	77.8%	64.3%	96.7%	95.2%
Cumberland	Stone Memorial High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.1%	87.6%	85.6%	54.6%	89.0%	89.5%	62.2%	97.7%	97.3%
DeKalb	De Kalb County High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.2%	91.3%	83.4%	52.8%	94.7%	86.7%	59.7%	98.2%	95.5%
Dickson	Creek Wood High School	9-12	Target				80.0%	77.4%	81.8%	17.4%	84.8%	78.0%	55.6%	97.9%	96.3%
Dickson	Dickson County High School	9-12	Good Standing				87.9%	85.3%	85.0%	49.2%	86.6%	83.3%	71.2%	98.0%	96.2%
Dyer	Dyer County High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.8%	91.1%	91.9%	69.0%	94.3%	94.3%	61.1%	98.4%	97.8%
Dyersburg	Dyersburg High School	9-12	Good Standing				90.0%	89.0%	89.2%	53.6%	69.5%	91.5%	56.9%	94.1%	96.9%
Elizabethton	Elizabethton High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.0%	90.0%	87.9%	41.0%	83.9%	90.1%	67.2%	100.0%	98.4%
Fayetteville	Fayetteville Jr High	7-9	Good Standing							71.3%	98.2%	91.4%	61.3%	95.8%	90.6%
Gibson SSD	South Gibson County High School	9-12	Good Standing							48.8%			69.3%		
Giles	Giles Co High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T2	Y		89.6%	83.4%	77.6%	19.5%	67.0%	70.5%	55.2%	95.7%	95.2%
Giles	Richland School	5-12	Good Standing				90.0%	93.3%	93.0%	44.4%	80.2%	78.9%	56.6%	99.2%	95.5%
Grainger	Grainger High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving				94.8%	89.6%		48.5%	84.1%	85.1%	62.9%	96.0%	97.9%
Grundy	Grundy County High School	9-12	Target				86.5%	93.3%	83.7%	33.4%	92.1%	88.7%	58.0%	99.5%	95.3%
Hamblen	Morristown East High	9-12	Good Standing				93.0%	93.0%	88.3%	45.5%	85.0%	84.1%	59.4%	99.0%	97.6%
Hamblen	Morristown West High	9-12	Good Standing				93.3%	96.1%	87.5%	67.0%	87.4%	86.5%	70.9%	98.0%	96.9%
Hamilton	Central High School	9-12	School Improvement 2				82.7%	79.3%	76.9%	23.1%	83.9%	77.4%	56.7%	98.3%	98.3%
Hamilton	Chatt High Center For Creative Arts	6-12	Good Standing				97.4%	93.3%	95.2%	74.2%	89.0%	78.9%	80.6%	100.0%	99.0%
Hamilton	Hamilton County High School	10-12	N<10 - Small School Review	T3		Y	58.9%	27.7%	34.2%	N<10	51.5%	56.9%	N<10	86.7%	92.6%
Hamilton	Hixson High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		79.8%	78.8%	77.9%	24.1%	46.7%	35.4%	51.2%	91.0%	86.8%
Hamilton	Sale Creek Middle / High School	6-12	Target				86.3%	79.1%	80.4%	41.5%	77.2%	63.8%	64.9%	100.0%	100.0%
Hardin	Hardin County High School	9-12	Good Standing				85.5%	90.8%	87.0%	34.0%	88.5%	88.4%	52.8%	97.2%	98.8%
Hawkins	Cherokee High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving				88.5%	83.5%	74.2%	43.1%	92.3%	92.1%	50.6%	93.2%	90.3%

**2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool**  
**134 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	School		NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Hawkins	Volunteer High School	9-12	Good Standing				90.3%	91.7%	88.9%	54.1%	87.1%	87.2%	59.6%	96.3%	97.3%
Haywood	Haywood High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		76.2%	78.4%	79.7%	40.8%	74.0%	76.7%	35.8%	93.1%	91.4%
Henry	Henry Co High School	10-12	Good Standing				88.2%	86.9%	81.8%	48.3%	63.0%	46.0%	61.8%	97.1%	93.0%
Hickman	East Hickman High School	9-12	Good Standing				89.7%	89.5%	91.1%	8.3%	88.2%	88.1%	35.6%	96.8%	95.7%
Hickman	Hickman Co Sr High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.8%	91.5%	92.1%	10.9%	91.8%	84.2%	48.6%	97.6%	97.5%
Humboldt	Humboldt High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		84.7%	84.1%	79.2%	23.2%	78.0%	85.4%	37.5%	91.3%	89.9%
Humphreys	Mc Ewen High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving				94.4%	92.5%	78.1%	32.4%	85.2%	83.8%	61.0%	94.6%	98.8%
Humphreys	Waverly Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.1%	86.2%	89.2%	31.8%	85.5%	85.7%	58.5%	97.1%	96.8%
Huntingdon	Huntingdon High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.1%	95.8%	89.0%	55.1%	81.9%	79.2%	62.2%	98.7%	96.0%
Jefferson	Jefferson Co High School	9-12	Good Standing				95.7%	88.3%	85.4%	44.0%	85.8%	78.8%	64.8%	98.7%	96.6%
Johnson	Johnson Co High School	9-12	Good Standing				97.7%	90.5%	90.3%	48.8%	77.7%	85.3%	42.8%	92.4%	93.9%
Johnson City	Science Hill High School	8-12	Good Standing				93.5%	94.9%	93.3%	79.2%	93.8%	91.5%	72.5%	98.8%	96.4%
Kingsport	Dobyns - Bennett High	9-12	Good Standing				94.8%	93.1%	90.0%	60.9%	87.1%	89.3%	69.7%	98.5%	97.9%
Knox	Gibbs High School	9-12	Corrective Action				83.2%	76.8%	73.6%	25.1%	72.8%	74.7%	58.8%	96.9%	94.4%
Knox	Karns High School	9-12	Good Standing				85.5%	87.2%	86.9%	31.7%	89.4%	86.3%	66.0%	99.1%	96.0%
Knox	Powell High School	9-12	Target				89.8%	85.1%	89.3%	37.2%	78.5%	78.6%	68.6%	96.0%	93.5%
Knox	Ridgedale Alternative School	6-12	N<10							33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	33.3%		
Lauderdale	Halls High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.6%	82.6%	86.1%	53.3%	85.8%	85.9%	52.0%	97.0%	92.6%
Lenoir City	Lenoir City High School	9-12	Good Standing				95.3%	88.7%	93.1%	43.4%	85.5%	86.5%	66.3%	96.5%	97.5%
Lincoln	Lincoln County High School	10-12	Good Standing				89.2%	86.6%	85.9%	26.3%	78.6%	83.0%	62.1%	98.6%	97.1%
Lincoln	Lincoln County Ninth Grade Academy	9	Good Standing							64.8%	100.0%	100.0%			
Loudon	Loudon High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		87.0%	86.4%	89.7%	22.5%	64.2%	79.1%	49.7%	95.9%	94.5%
Macon	Macon County High School	9-12	Good Standing				86.9%	85.7%	83.5%	27.5%	82.1%	84.0%	53.6%	94.4%	95.8%
Madison	South Side High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.5%	87.6%	88.0%	46.1%	80.7%	70.3%	48.6%	89.2%	92.9%
Madison	West Jackson Learning Center	9-12	N<10							N<10	24.5%	16.9%	N<10	65.4%	60.5%
Marion	Marion Co High School	9-12	Corrective Action				87.0%	87.1%	90.4%	53.8%	91.0%	92.1%	69.4%	97.9%	95.9%
Marshall	Cornersville School	7-12	Good Standing				92.9%	93.2%	94.4%	54.5%	90.2%	82.8%	51.2%	90.9%	94.2%
Marshall	Forrest School	6-12	Good Standing				89.2%	89.4%	89.6%	56.5%	83.4%	76.0%	68.3%	97.7%	97.3%
Marshall	Marshall Co High School	9-12	Good Standing				90.5%	91.8%	85.0%	51.5%	88.5%	62.7%	53.0%	97.9%	92.9%
Maury	Columbia Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				78.5%	77.5%	72.0%	42.8%	89.0%	88.1%	61.3%	95.1%	96.7%
Maury	Culleoka Unit School	PK-12	School Improvement 1				93.7%	75.3%	78.4%	37.7%	78.8%	71.1%	56.8%	97.1%	95.8%
Maury	Hampshire Unit School	K-12	Good Standing				100.0%	96.8%	89.7%	48.0%	97.3%	97.1%	73.5%	100.0%	97.1%
Maury	Mt Pleasant High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		78.2%	80.0%	77.7%	22.1%	70.9%	65.3%	34.2%	88.1%	85.6%
Maury	Santa Fe Unit School	PK-12	Target				96.3%	86.3%	94.3%	41.3%	75.9%	83.3%	67.9%	98.2%	96.6%
McKenzie	McKenzie High School	9-12	Good Standing				96.2%	96.1%	100.0%	40.0%	84.9%	77.1%	77.9%	94.9%	93.7%
McMinn	Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				90.0%	93.8%	88.4%	38.1%	72.0%	73.9%	60.9%	88.9%	91.7%
McMinn	McMinn High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		88.1%	89.4%	89.6%	19.6%	63.3%	69.2%	51.1%	95.5%	95.3%
McNairy	Adamsville Junior / Senior High School	7-12	Good Standing				95.7%	95.7%	96.2%	38.9%	89.5%	91.0%	70.7%	98.4%	99.3%
McNairy	McNairy Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.5%	93.4%	90.5%	53.5%	92.2%	80.7%	53.6%	99.1%	98.3%
Meigs	Meigs County High School	PK 9-12	Good Standing				100.0%	96.0%	90.4%	41.0%	81.0%	82.0%	58.9%	96.6%	92.7%
Memphis	White Station High School	9-12	Good Standing				82.4%	85.9%	86.3%	45.1%	81.4%	75.4%	73.0%	97.1%	96.6%

**2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool**  
**134 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	School		NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Milan	Milan High School	9-12	Good Standing				97.1%	97.1%	95.5%	45.4%	92.8%	90.5%	67.9%	98.8%	95.9%
Monroe	Monroe Academy	9-12	N<10 - Small School Review				65.1%	42.3%		13.3%	50.0%		36.4%	60.0%	
Monroe	Sequoyah High School	9-12	Good Standing	T2	Y		90.6%	90.5%	79.9%	32.4%	73.6%	72.7%	51.7%	92.4%	92.3%
Montgomery	Kenwood High School	9-12	Good Standing				87.7%	87.0%	80.1%	30.0%	69.5%	74.8%	54.9%	96.1%	96.6%
Montgomery	Montgomery Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				84.9%	92.6%	90.0%	49.2%	76.3%	89.1%	65.1%	95.0%	95.2%
Montgomery	Northwest High School	9-12	Good Standing				90.5%	86.0%	85.1%	36.2%	81.4%	79.0%	61.7%	97.8%	96.5%
Montgomery	West Creek High School	9-12	Good Standing				94.0%			55.2%			66.9%		
Moore	Moore County High School	7-12	Good Standing				92.2%	86.3%	90.0%	37.8%	91.6%	90.6%	58.8%	92.5%	100.0%
Morgan	Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				96.3%	95.3%	91.9%	25.6%	78.3%	75.4%	50.5%	95.2%	97.5%
Obion	Obion County Central High School	9-12	Good Standing				87.2%	85.9%	85.1%	40.3%	80.5%	77.5%	66.5%	98.1%	98.8%
Obion	South Fulton Middle / High School	6-12	Good Standing				94.6%	95.4%	96.2%	53.4%	81.1%	79.6%	66.2%	98.4%	92.3%
Overton	Livingston Academy	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving				91.8%	91.7%	89.4%	25.6%	85.4%	83.6%	62.7%	97.5%	93.0%
Perry	Perry County High School	9-12	Good Standing				94.1%	94.0%	90.8%	31.9%	76.7%	87.0%	66.3%	98.8%	100.0%
Polk	Copper Basin High School	7-12	Target				82.5%	90.2%	91.1%	52.4%	75.0%	82.8%	62.5%	98.2%	98.2%
Polk	Polk County High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving				89.0%	88.0%	79.6%	21.5%	73.4%	75.8%	56.0%	98.1%	98.5%
Putnam	Cookeville High School	9-12	Good Standing				90.9%	93.0%	89.2%	43.6%	85.0%	89.4%	70.4%	98.9%	98.5%
Rhea	Rhea County High School	9-12	Good Standing				82.5%	82.2%	83.4%	40.6%	79.8%	76.9%	62.2%	96.7%	97.1%
Roane	Harriman High School	9-12	Good Standing				91.4%	93.7%	98.3%	20.2%	78.3%	79.8%	67.9%	97.5%	95.6%
Roane	Midway High School	9-12	Good Standing				77.8%	93.2%	85.2%	55.2%	85.9%	82.8%	51.1%	96.3%	93.7%
Roane	Oliver Springs High School	9-12	Good Standing				85.0%	96.9%	93.3%	35.0%	78.8%	70.9%	61.9%	96.7%	95.6%
Roane	Roane County High School	9-12	Good Standing				88.1%	94.6%	96.1%	44.6%	85.7%	83.9%	74.7%	99.0%	99.5%
Roane	Rockwood High School	9-12	Good Standing				76.7%	96.1%	92.7%	40.5%	89.8%	82.5%	70.7%	97.2%	94.3%
Robertson	Jo Byrns High School	6-12	Good Standing				93.2%	94.7%	96.6%	46.2%	88.1%	81.8%	70.0%	96.6%	97.7%
Robertson	Springfield High School	9-12	Good Standing				84.6%	89.0%	84.5%	31.8%	84.4%	87.5%	49.0%	97.4%	98.2%
Rutherford	Holloway High School	9-12	Good Standing				85.5%	85.4%	89.7%	29.4%	89.1%	90.2%	40.5%	100.0%	98.6%
Rutherford	Lavergne High School	9-12	Good Standing				77.5%	87.5%	84.7%	39.4%	76.8%	67.1%	60.6%	97.9%	93.7%
Rutherford	Oakland High School	9-12	Good Standing				92.0%	91.0%	85.7%	30.1%	84.1%	74.1%	60.0%	97.5%	95.8%
Rutherford	Smyrna High School	9-12	Good Standing				89.9%	92.4%	88.2%	52.2%	89.1%	82.9%	64.8%	99.3%	98.4%
Sevier	Gatlinburg Pittman High	9-12	Good Standing				88.4%	93.0%	89.6%	50.7%	83.6%	87.1%	63.4%	100.0%	97.1%
Sevier	Parkway Academy	6-12	N<10							N<10	60.0%	21.2%	N<10	80.0%	88.5%
Sevier	Pigeon Forge High School	9-12	Good Standing				88.7%	87.0%	80.5%	55.5%	87.9%	86.0%	61.3%	94.2%	93.0%
Sevier	Sevier County High School	9-12	Good Standing				88.1%	85.4%	85.1%	45.6%	75.9%	81.2%	55.3%	96.0%	93.9%
Smith	Gordonsville High School	7-12	Good Standing				97.8%	98.9%	99.0%	33.6%	85.6%	84.0%	61.5%	97.7%	97.5%
Smith	Smith County High School	9-12	Good Standing				94.1%	92.0%	93.4%	40.0%	86.5%	84.1%	57.4%	96.6%	95.3%
Stewart	Stewart Co High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.7%	93.5%	96.3%	73.1%	89.3%	91.1%	60.9%	97.4%	94.7%
Sullivan	Sullivan East High School	9-12	School Improvement 1				85.9%	74.1%	75.1%	39.9%	83.9%	84.0%	61.6%	96.0%	94.4%
Sumner	Gallatin Senior High School	9-12	Good Standing				88.2%	87.8%	82.9%	42.4%	83.2%	79.9%	54.0%	95.8%	95.4%
Sumner	Portland High School	9-12	School Improvement 2 - Improving				87.9%	86.9%	81.5%	30.9%	80.9%	76.6%	51.7%	95.7%	91.6%
Sumner	Westmoreland High School	9-12	Target				91.3%	89.1%	93.1%	50.9%	81.1%	80.0%	64.8%	97.6%	93.4%
Tipton	Brighton High School	9-12	Good Standing				95.1%	98.1%	96.3%	45.5%	94.4%	96.1%	65.9%	96.1%	96.0%
Tipton	Covington High School	9-12	Good Standing				92.7%	93.3%	88.4%	75.0%	92.2%	66.9%	50.0%	92.1%	88.5%

**2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool**  
**134 Schools - % Proficient/Advanced Data**

District	School		NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	2010-11 Reason Lowest 5% of Tier	2010-11 Reason Grad Rate <80%	GRAD RATE 2010	GRAD RATE 2009	GRAD RATE 2008	09-10 MATH %P/A	08-09 MATH %P/A	07-08 MATH %P/A	09-10 RLA %P/A	08-09 RLA %P/A	07-08 RLA %P/A
Tipton	Munford High School	5-8	Good Standing				94.4%	96.8%	92.4%	51.4%	92.7%	90.3%	67.3%	98.8%	95.8%
Trousdale	Trousdale Co High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.0%	96.2%	92.2%	64.9%	94.9%	94.6%	58.2%	95.9%	97.6%
Union	Union County Alternative Center	6-12	N<10	T3						N<10	10.0%	37.5%	N<10	85.7%	88.9%
Union City	Union City High School	9-12	Good Standing				89.2%	86.1%	84.5%	32.1%	81.9%	91.7%	49.2%	89.2%	96.9%
W. Carroll SSD	West Carroll Junior/Senior High School	7-12	Good Standing				95.5%	95.3%	94.9%	45.0%	83.2%	67.9%	40.7%	96.0%	95.3%
Warren	Warren County High School	9-12	Target				88.9%	86.1%	82.3%	34.1%	79.9%	82.5%	53.3%	94.8%	93.8%
Washington	Daniel Boone High School	9-12	Good Standing				84.4%	90.7%	85.9%	37.7%	79.1%	77.3%	64.0%	95.3%	94.7%
Wayne	Collinwood High School	9-12	Good Standing				93.3%	97.8%	95.2%	30.0%	82.2%	83.7%	63.4%	97.8%	97.7%
Wayne	Wayne County High School	9-12	Good Standing				95.5%	92.5%	83.7%	46.3%	82.4%	78.5%	57.1%	96.0%	98.0%
Wilson	Lebanon High School	9-12	School Improvement 1 - Improving				91.3%	89.5%	82.1%	63.5%	84.9%	87.7%	63.1%	98.2%	97.9%
Wilson	Watertown High School	9-12	Good Standing				94.6%	87.0%	84.1%	30.1%	82.2%	87.1%	55.8%	98.1%	97.6%



## 2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool

### 134 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	NEW SIG & FTTT RANK	NEW Final RANK INDEX	NEW Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	NEW 09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	NEW 09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Alcoa	Alcoa High School	Good Standing		6	68	68	52	16	71	33	13	19	29	3	52	4
Anderson	Anderson County High School	Good Standing		55	234	234	109	125	106	112	25	90	48	100	16	64
Anderson	Clinton High School	Good Standing		96	323	323	167	156	192	142	78	114	106	78	78	36
Bedford	Cascade School	Target		56	240.5	240.5	148.5	92	93	204	31	84	92	61	9	112
Bedford	Central High School	Target		52	223	223	135	88	110	160	33	107	103	55	3	57
Bedford	Community High School	Good Standing	T2	116	397.5	397.5	203.5	194	200	207	111	103	97	83	97	110
Benton	Camden Central High School	Good Standing		77	276.5	276.5	185.5	91	196	175	45	96	85	46	100	90
Blount	Heritage High School	Good Standing		66	261.5	261.5	152.5	109	184	121	53	99	96	56	85	25
Blount	William Blount High School	Target		63	259	259	109	150	139	79	75	68	42	75	71	37
Bradley	Bradley Central High School	Good Standing		114	384.5	384.5	200.5	184	217	184	90	109	79	94	108	105
Bradley	Walker Valley High School	Good Standing		60	250.5	250.5	173.5	77	178	169	56	89	69	21	89	100
Bristol	Tennessee High School	Good Standing		10	91.5	91.5	78.5	13	29	128	11	9	49	2	20	79
Cannon	Cannon County High School	Target		106	361	361	138	223	169	107	109	113	105	114	56	2
Cheatham	Cheatham Co Central	Target		80	282	282	124	158	172	76	93	73	24	65	99	52
Cheatham	Sycamore High School	Good Standing		34	189.5	189.5	87.5	102	83	92	84	39	44	18	44	48
Chester	Chester County High School	Good Standing		107	363	363	183	180	183	183	101	120	117	79	63	66
Coffee	Coffee County Central High School	Target		89	299.5	299.5	143.5	156	112	175	76	57	107	80	55	68
Crockett	Crockett County High School	Good Standing		69	265.5	265.5	55.5	210	47	64	108	40	9	102	7	55
Cumberland	Cumberland County High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving		40	199.5	199.5	132.5	67	101	164	28	35	87	39	66	77
Cumberland	Stone Memorial High School	Good Standing		18	128.5	128.5	62.5	66	70	55	19	27	20	47	43	35
DeKalb	De Kalb County High School	Good Standing		28	167	167	70	97	32	108	29	5	36	68	27	72
Dickson	Creek Wood High School	Target		100	331	331	116	215	92	140	125	56	86	90	36	54
Dickson	Dickson County High School	Good Standing		21	144	144	96	48	75	117	39	41	61	9	34	56
Dyer	Dyer County High School	Good Standing		11	95.5	95.5	29.5	66	31	28	6	7	5	60	24	23
Dyersburg	Dyersburg High School	Good Standing		58	243.5	243.5	136.5	107	220	53	23	119	10	84	101	43
Elizabethton	Elizabethton High School	Good Standing		19	141.5	141.5	48.5	93	64	33	68	63	19	25	1	14
Fayetteville	Fayetteville Jr High	Good Standing		27	166	166	103	63	85	121	5	2	12	58	83	109
Gibson SSD	South Gibson County High School	Good Standing		4	58	58	0	58	0	0	41	0	0	17	0	0
Giles	Giles Co High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving	T2	120	415.5	415.5	199.5	216	208	191	124	121	113	92	87	78
Giles	Richland School	Good Standing		70	266	266	121	145	90	152	58	85	81	87	5	71
Grainger	Grainger High School	School Improvement 2 - Improving		35	190	190	104	86	140	68	42	60	47	44	80	21
Grundy	Grundy County High School	Target		53	227	227	58	169	17	99	92	15	25	77	2	74
Hamblen	Morristown East High	Good Standing		44	204.5	204.5	83.5	121	88	79	51	53	52	70	35	27
Hamblen	Morristown West High	Good Standing		9	91	91	74	17	69	79	7	36	38	10	33	41
Hamilton	Central High School	School Improvement 2		89	299.5	299.5	95.5	204	86	105	118	61	89	86	25	16
Hamilton	Chatt High Center For Creative Arts	Good Standing		5	62.5	62.5	58.5	4	30	87	3	29	81	1	1	6
Hamilton	Hamilton County High School	N<10 - Small School Review	T3	124	473.5	473.5	233.5	240	242	225	129	126	123	111	116	102
Hamilton	Hixson High School	Good Standing	T2	123	462.5	462.5	240.5	222	238	243	116	128	126	106	110	117
Hamilton	Sale Creek Middle / High School	Target		47	211.5	211.5	111.5	100	101	122	65	100	121	35	1	1
Hardin	Hardin County High School	Good Standing		59	248.5	248.5	58.5	190	83	34	89	30	26	101	53	8
Hawkins	Cherokee High School	School Improvement 2 - Improving		82	286.5	286.5	115.5	171	114	117	62	12	6	109	102	111

## 2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool

### 134 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	NEW SIG & FTTT RANK	NEW Final RANK INDEX	NEW Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	NEW 09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	NEW 09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Hawkins	Volunteer High School	Good Standing		30	178	178	88	90	110	66	21	38	32	69	72	34
Haywood	Haywood High School	Good Standing	T2	117	399.5	399.5	207.5	192	213	202	69	110	94	123	103	108
Henry	Henry Co High School	Good Standing		86	296.5	296.5	201.5	95	182	221	43	124	124	52	58	97
Hickman	East Hickman High School	Good Standing		103	347.5	347.5	95.5	252	96	95	128	32	28	124	64	67
Hickman	Hickman Co Sr High School	Good Standing		94	316	316	72	244	62	82	127	16	50	117	46	32
Humboldt	Humboldt High School	Good Standing	T2	121	420	420	182	238	206	158	117	97	45	121	109	113
Humphreys	Mc Ewen High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving		68	263.5	263.5	106.5	157	147	66	95	51	57	62	96	9
Humphreys	Waverly Central High School	Good Standing		72	268	268	96	172	105	87	98	48	43	74	57	44
Huntingdon	Huntingdon High School	Good Standing		31	182	182	115	67	93	137	18	75	77	49	18	60
Jefferson	Jefferson Co High School	Good Standing		36	193.5	193.5	96.5	97	62	131	59	45	82	38	17	49
Johnson	Johnson Co High School	Good Standing		97	326	326	168	158	203	133	40	98	46	118	105	87
Johnson City	Science Hill High School	Good Standing		3	52.5	52.5	43.5	9	23	64	1	8	11	8	15	53
Kingsport	Dobyns - Bennett High	Good Standing		8	77	77	50	27	58	42	12	37	22	15	21	20
Knox	Gibbs High School	Corrective Action		110	370.5	370.5	182.5	188	177	188	115	115	104	73	62	84
Knox	Kams High School	Good Standing		37	195	195	63	132	29	97	100	23	39	32	6	58
Knox	Powell High School	Target		78	278	278	174	104	171	177	85	94	83	19	77	94
Knox	Ridgedale Alternative School	N<10		81	284	284	65	219	129	1	93	129	1	126	0	0
Lauderdale	Halls High School	Good Standing		62	254.5	254.5	124.5	130	105	144	27	44	41	103	61	103
Lenoir City	Lenoir City High School	Good Standing		32	182.5	182.5	92.5	90	119	66	61	49	37	29	70	29
Lincoln	Lincoln County High School	Good Standing		73	268.5	268.5	106.5	162	112	101	112	93	62	50	19	39
Lincoln	Lincoln County Ninth Grade Academy	Good Standing		1	10	10	1	9	1	1	9	1	1	0	0	0
Loudon	Loudon High School	Good Standing	T2	118	412.5	412.5	181.5	231	203	160	119	122	78	112	81	82
Macon	Macon County High School	Good Standing		104	350	350	143	207	170	116	110	72	53	97	98	63
Madison	South Side High School	Good Standing		109	368	368	204	164	195	213	48	82	114	116	113	99
Madison	West Jackson Learning Center	N<10		112	375	375	248	127	249	247	0	130	128	127	119	119
Marion	Marion Co High School	Corrective Action		12	100.5	100.5	62.5	38	56	69	22	18	7	16	38	62
Marshall	Comersville School	Good Standing		71	267.5	267.5	141.5	126	131	152	20	20	66	106	111	86
Marshall	Forrest School	Good Standing		24	153	153	119	34	107	131	14	65	98	20	42	33
Marshall	Marshall Co High School	Good Standing		79	278.5	278.5	145.5	133	69	222	34	31	122	99	38	100
Maury	Columbia Central High School	Good Standing		49	218	218	96	122	120	72	63	28	27	59	92	45
Maury	Culleoka Unit School	School Improvement 1		99	329.5	329.5	162.5	167	151	174	82	91	111	85	60	63
Maury	Hampshire Unit School	Good Standing		7	72	72	22	50	4	40	44	3	2	6	1	38
Maury	Mt Pleasant High School	Good Standing	T2	125	480	480	235	245	232	238	120	117	120	125	115	118
Maury	Santa Fe Unit School	Target		46	209.5	209.5	120.5	89	134	107	66	106	60	23	28	47
McKenzie	McKenzie High School	Good Standing		57	242.5	242.5	165.5	77	149	182	73	55	91	4	94	91
McMinn	Central High School	Good Standing		108	365.5	365.5	222.5	143	230	215	80	116	109	63	114	106
McMinn	McMinn High School	Good Standing	T2	122	431	431	201	230	211	191	123	123	115	107	88	76
McNairy	Adamsville Junior / Senior High School	Good Standing		16	121.5	121.5	31.5	90	44	19	79	22	14	11	22	5
McNairy	McNairy Central High School	Good Standing		29	174	174	54	120	21	87	24	13	72	96	8	15
Meigs	Meigs County High School	Good Standing		87	297	297	159	138	148	170	67	80	69	71	68	101
Memphis	White Station High School	Good Standing		41	202.5	202.5	141.5	61	136	147	54	77	101	7	59	46

## 2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool

### 134 Schools - Ranking Information

District	School	NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	NEW SIG & FTTT RANK	NEW Final RANK INDEX	NEW Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	NEW 09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	NEW 09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Milan	Milan High School	Good Standing		17	124	124	50	74	23	77	52	10	16	22	13	61
Monroe	Monroe Academy	N<10 - Small School Review		111	371.5	371.5	123.5	248	247	0	126	127	0	122	120	0
Monroe	Sequoyah High School	Good Standing	T2	119	413.5	413.5	215.5	198	217	214	94	111	110	104	106	104
Montgomery	Kenwood High School	Good Standing		111	371.5	371.5	172.5	199	193	152	106	118	102	93	75	50
Montgomery	Montgomery Central High School	Good Standing		50	220.5	220.5	148.5	72	197	100	38	104	23	34	93	77
Montgomery	Northwest High School	Good Standing		67	262.5	262.5	123.5	139	116	131	86	76	80	53	40	51
Montgomery	West Creek High School	Good Standing		2	43	43	0	43	0	0	17	0	0	26	0	0
Moore	Moore County High School	Good Standing		51	221.5	221.5	68.5	153	121	16	81	17	15	72	104	1
Morgan	Central High School	Good Standing		113	381	381	158	223	186	130	113	95	100	110	91	30
Obion	Obion County Central High School	Good Standing		43	204	204	104	100	113	95	72	83	88	28	30	7
Obion	South Fulton Middle / High School	Good Standing		39	198	198	141	57	102	180	26	79	76	31	23	104
Overton	Livingston Academy	School Improvement 2 - Improving		83	287	287	128	159	99	157	114	50	59	45	49	98
Perry	Perry County High School	Good Standing		42	203	203	76	127	116	36	97	102	35	30	14	1
Polk	Copper Basin High School	Target		33	184	184	108	76	134	82	30	108	65	46	26	17
Polk	Polk County High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving		101	336.5	336.5	127.5	209	144	111	121	112	99	88	32	12
Putnam	Cokeville High School	Good Standing		15	120.5	120.5	47.5	73	63	32	60	52	21	13	11	11
Rhea	Rhea County High School	Good Standing		65	260.5	260.5	142.5	118	154	131	70	87	93	48	67	38
Roane	Harriman High School	Good Standing		83	287	287	143	144	142	144	122	95	75	22	47	69
Roane	Midway High School	Good Standing		64	260	260	136	124	116	156	16	43	64	108	73	92
Roane	Oliver Springs High School	Good Standing		90	307.5	307.5	169.5	138	157	182	87	92	112	51	65	70
Roane	Roane County High School	Good Standing		14	119.5	119.5	57.5	62	56	59	57	46	56	5	10	3
Roane	Rockwood High School	Good Standing		38	197	197	114	83	75	153	71	21	68	12	54	85
Robertson	Jo Byns High School	Good Standing		26	159	159	98	61	102	94	47	33	70	14	69	24
Robertson	Springfield High School	Good Standing		85	292.5	292.5	78.5	214	108	49	99	58	31	115	50	18
Rutherford	Holloway High School	Good Standing		62	254.5	254.5	27.5	227	27	28	107	26	18	120	1	10
Rutherford	Lavergne High School	Good Standing		95	317.5	317.5	174.5	143	138	211	77	101	118	66	37	93
Rutherford	Oakland High School	Good Standing		92	310	310	139	171	107	171	104	59	108	67	48	63
Rutherford	Smyrna High School	Good Standing		16	121.5	121.5	52.5	69	29	76	32	25	63	37	4	13
Sevier	Gatlinburg Pittman High	Good Standing		22	147.5	147.5	69.5	78	65	74	37	64	34	41	1	40
Sevier	Parkway Academy	N<10		74	270	270	243	27	243	243	0	125	127	27	118	116
Sevier	Pigeon Forge High School	Good Standing		45	206.5	206.5	134.5	72	133	136	15	34	40	57	99	96
Sevier	Sevier County High School	Good Standing		93	311.5	311.5	171.5	140	184	159	49	105	71	91	79	88
Smith	Gordonville High School	Good Standing		54	233	233	87	146	88	86	91	47	55	55	41	31
Smith	Smith County High School	Good Standing		75	272	272	118	154	111	125	73	42	51	81	69	74
Stewart	Stewart Co High School	Good Standing		23	152	152	84	68	75	93	4	24	13	64	51	80
Sullivan	Sullivan East High School	School Improvement 1		70	266	266	138	128	139	137	74	62	54	54	77	83
Sumner	Gallatin Senior High School	Good Standing		91	308	308	149	159	151	147	64	67	74	95	84	73
Sumner	Portland High School	School Improvement 2 - Improving		115	391.5	391.5	184.5	207	167	202	102	81	95	105	86	107
Sumner	Westmoreland High School	Target		48	217.5	217.5	145.5	72	123	168	36	78	73	36	45	95
Tipton	Brighton High School	Good Standing		25	154	154	71	83	80	62	50	6	3	33	74	59
Tipton	Covington High School	Good Standing		84	290.5	290.5	177.5	113	121	234	2	14	119	111	107	115

**2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool**  
**134 Schools - Ranking Information**

District	School	NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	NEW SIG & FTTT RANK	NEW Final RANK INDEX	NEW Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	NEW 09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	NEW 09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
Tipton	Munford High School	Good Standing		13	111.5	111.5	52.5	59	23	82	35	11	17	24	12	65
Trousdale	Trousdale Co High School	Good Standing		20	143	143	59	84	86	32	8	4	4	76	82	28
Union	Union County Alternative Center	N<10	T3	126	499.5	499.5	243.5	256	248	239	129	131	125	127	117	114
Union City	Union City High School	Good Standing		98	327	327	118	209	186	50	96	74	8	113	112	42
W. Carroll SSD	West Carroll Junior/Senior High School	Good Standing		102	342	342	168	174	145	191	55	66	116	119	79	75
Warren	Warren County High School	Target		105	354.5	354.5	168.5	186	181	156	88	86	67	98	95	89
Washington	Daniel Boone High School	Good Standing		88	297.5	297.5	174.5	123	178	171	83	88	90	40	90	81
Wayne	Collinwood High School	Good Standing		58	243.5	243.5	96.5	147	109	84	105	70	58	42	39	26
Wayne	Wayne County High School	Good Standing		61	252	252	124	128	145	103	46	69	84	82	76	19
Wilson	Lebanon High School	School Improvement 1 - Improving		15	120.5	120.5	67.5	53	83	52	10	54	30	43	29	22
Wilson	Watertown High School	Good Standing		76	273.5	273.5	81.5	192	102	61	103	71	33	89	31	28



**2010-11 Tier 2 Selection Pool**  
**134 Schools - Ranking Information**

District	School	NCLB Status 2010-11	TIER	NEW SIG & FTTT RANK	NEW Final RANK INDEX	NEW Combined RANK INDEX	Prior Years RANK INDEX	NEW 09-10 Rank Index	08-09 Rank Index	07-08 Rank Index	NEW 09-10 Math Rank	08-09 Math Rank	07-08 Math Rank	09-10 RLA Rank	08-09 RLA Rank	07-08 RLA Rank
----------	--------	---------------------	------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

**TIER 1: Persistently Lowest-achieving - Any Title I High Priority school that is either:**

- 1) In the lowest-achieving 5% based on highest numerical Final Rank Index; OR
- 2) Has a graduation rate less than 60% for any 2 of the last 3 years.

**TIER 2: Persistently Lowest-achieving - Any High School eligible for (Low Income Family =>35%) but not "served" by Title I that is either:**

- 1) In the lowest-achieving 5% based on highest numerical Final Rank Index; OR
- 2) Has a graduation rate less than 60% for any 2 of the last 3 years.

**TIER 3: Title I High Priority schools not identified as Tier 1**

Identified schools with N<10 are placed in T3

**When determining Tiers, the USDOE allows percentages for Every Test Taker (ETT) in the ALL subgroup to be used and not AYP data.**

Math %P/A: Percent proficient/advanced for ETT ~ K8: TCAP 3-8 Math & HS: Algebra I assessments.

RLA %P/A: Percent proficient/advanced for ETT ~ K8: TCAP 3-8 Reading/Language Arts (RLA) & HS: English II assessments.

Tier 1 selection pool includes 147 schools

Tier 2 selection pool includes 134 schools

**Within each tier pool of school, numerical rank index is determined based upon the following series of calculations:**

- 1) The current year math score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest math percent proficient and advanced;
- 2) The current year reading/language arts score for all students is ranked by sorting schools from highest to lowest reading/language arts percent proficient and advanced;
- 3) The math and reading/language arts ranks are summed for current year rank index;
- 4) Two prior years are ranked using the same method;
- 5) Two prior year ranks are averaged for prior years rank index;
- 6) Current year rank index and prior years rank index are summed to create the combined rank index;
- 7) Lastly, five percent of schools with the highest numerical final rank index are identified.

**Notes:**

High priority schools are defined as schools with an improvement status or those in improvement, corrective action, or any form of restructuring as specified in ESEA.

Elementary and secondary schools are weighted equally.

Secondary schools are defined as high schools.

For schools serving both grade spans, high school achievement data is used.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b>Section III - LEA Descriptive Information</b>			
<b>LEA Name:</b>			
<b>Strong</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Inadequate or Not Provided</b>
<b>Capacity:</b>			
<b>1. LEA Support to Implementation</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a detailed description of its support and response specifically to SIG schools and how the process will differ from response to other schools.  Support consists of a structure of support that includes principal's direct access to the Superintendent/Director of School on a regular basis, designated central office staff to work solely with SIG schools, and district staff in areas of curriculum, special education, student support to work in SIG schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a detailed description of its support and response that is comparable to what is provided in other schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a general description of its support.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides no description of capacity to support and to respond to SIG schools.
<b>2. Commitment to Support from Relevant Stakeholders</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a detailed description and evidence of its commitment to support from staff, parents, teachers' union, and school board.  The LEA provides methods used	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a general description and evidence of its commitment to support from stakeholders.  The LEA provides methods used to consult with stakeholders on LEA application and selection of	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a general description and evidence of its commitment to limited support from stakeholders.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools but provides no evidence of support from relevant stakeholders.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

to consult with all above mentioned stakeholder groups on LEA application and selection of intervention model.	intervention model.		
<b>3. LEA SIG Leadership</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed description of a district leadership team that includes a School Improvement Coordinator employed full time to lead the district support team and provide support to schools.  The SIG Coordinator has experience and expertise in school reform. The leadership team is comprised of professionals with expertise in working with low-achieving Title I schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed description of a district leadership team that includes a School Improvement Coordinator employed to lead the district support team. The SIG Coordinator has responsibilities in addition to the SIG or is a part-time employee.  The leadership team is comprised of professionals with expertise in working with low-achieving Title I schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a general description of a district leadership team that includes a School Improvement Coordinator employed to lead the district support team.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides scant information about its SIG leadership team.
<b>4. LEA Federal Grant Office</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed description of its past history of grants management of multiple federal grants.  The LEA indicates that it draws down federal funds at least quarterly.  The LEA indicates that it has had no audit findings within the past five years.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed description of its past history of grants management of multiple federal grants.  The LEA indicates that it draws down federal funds at least quarterly.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed description of its past history of grants management of multiple federal grants that includes one audit finding within the past five years.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a description of its past history of grants management of multiple federal grants that includes multiple audit finding within the past five years.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b>5. Availability of Human Capital</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has a strong plan in place for the recruitment and selection of school leaders, teachers, and staff to work in its lowest performing schools.  The LEA has formed partnerships with other organizations to develop human capital.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has a strong plan in place for the recruitment and selection of school leaders, teachers, and staff to work in its lowest performing schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a general plan for the recruitment and selection of school leaders, teachers, and staff to work in its lowest performing schools. There is no indication that the plan is currently in place.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides an inadequate plan for the recruitment and selection of school leaders, teachers, and staff.
<b>6. Process of Removal of Ineffective Principals and Teachers</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has a strong plan in place for the removal of ineffective principals and teachers based on an equitable evaluation system for both. The evaluation takes multiple observation of performance and takes into account performance evaluation over a period of two years.  The plan provides ample opportunities for personnel to improve their professional practice prior to removal.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a proposed plan for the removal of ineffective principals and teachers based on an equitable evaluation system for both.  The evaluation takes multiple observation of performance and takes into account performance evaluation over a period of two years.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a general description of a proposed plan for the removal of ineffective principals and teachers.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides an inadequate description of a proposed plan for the removal of ineffective principals and teachers.
<b>7. Plans for On-Going Monitoring and Evaluation</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a description of its plan for on-going evaluation and monitoring that includes progress toward annual student	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a description of its plan for on-going evaluation and monitoring that includes progress toward annual student	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA has reviewed its capacity to serve schools and provides a description of its plan for on-going evaluation and monitoring of implementation of interventions.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA does not provide plans for on-going evaluation and monitoring of schools receiving School Improvement funds.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<p>achievement goals, SIG leading indicators and implementation of interventions.</p> <p>Designated personnel are assigned to monitor to conduct on-site school visits and monthly meetings with school personnel to check progress.</p>	<p>achievement goals, SIG leading indicators and implementation of interventions.</p> <p>Designated personnel are assigned to monitor to conduct on-site school visits and quarterly meetings with school personnel to check progress.</p>		
<p><b>8. Lack of Capacity:</b> If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school,</p>			
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school and provides a strong rationale for lack of capacity, including inability to implement model specific requirements.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school and provides a rationale for lack of capacity, limited to its inability to implement model specific requirements.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school and provides a general rationale for lack of capacity that fails to address inability to implement model specific requirements.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school and provides no rationale for lack of capacity.</p>
<p><b>Capacity</b> <b>Number of responses indicating</b></p>			
<p><b>Strong Capacity</b> = _____</p>		<p><b>Limited Capacity</b> = _____</p>	
<p><b>Moderate Capacity</b> = _____</p>		<p><b>Response Not Provided</b> = _____</p>	

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b>Preparation for Implementation of Interventions</b>			
<b>Recruitment, Screening and Selection of External Providers</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA describes a rigorous recruiting, screening, and selection process that includes a request for information (RFI) or other process for identification of potential providers, a protocol for analysis of the connection between the provider's experience and the district and each school's comprehensive needs assessment.  The LEA includes a MOU that addresses the provider's responsibilities that are alignment with each school's needs, the LEA and provider's shared accountability for the full and effective implementation of the intervention model and student achievement in the selected school.  The LEA's process includes a detailed description of monitoring and oversight of the provider's services.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA describes a recruiting, screening, and selection process that includes a process for identification of potential providers, a protocol for analysis of the connection between the provider's experience and the district and each school's comprehensive needs assessment.  The LEA includes a MOU that addresses the provider's responsibilities generally alignment with each school's needs, the LEA and provider's shared accountability for the full and effective implementation of the intervention model and student achievement in the selected school.  The LEA's process includes a general description of monitoring and oversight of the provider's services.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA describes a recruiting, screening, and selection process that includes a protocol for analysis of the connection between the provider's experience and district and school needs.  The LEA includes a description of the provider's responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA does not provide recruiting, screening, and selection process for its external provider to implement the school's model or selected intervention activities.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b>Alignment of Resources to Support Interventions</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed description of specific actions it will take to allocate additional funds to its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools to align those funds with SIG funds.  The LEA identifies and provides a description of the federal, state and local resources as well as community and other resources will support intervention activities in the budget justification documents.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a general description of actions it will take to allocate additional funds to its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools to align with SIG funds.  The LEA identifies of federal, state and local resources will support intervention activities in the budget justification documents.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA indicates that is will allocate additional funds to its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools to align with SIG funds.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA lists other LEA activities in the school budget.
<b>Modification of Practices and Policies to Enable Full Implementation of Model</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA is aware of current and potential barriers to the effective implementation of intervention models. It provides a clear and detailed description of a plan that it will undertake to modify practices and policies that will enable the full and effective implementation of intervention models. The description demonstrates a thorough understanding and anticipation of the potential barriers related to the implementation of the intervention model  The plan describes topics that	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed description of a plan that it will undertake to modify practices and policies to enable the full and effective implementation of intervention models.  The plan describes topics that currently require modification, the current progress of modifications.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a limited description of a plan that it will undertake to modify practices and policies that will enable the full and effective implementation of the intervention model.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides an inadequate plan to address existing and potential barriers.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<p>currently require modification, the current progress of modifications, and procedures to address any future modifications.</p> <p>The LEA plan includes the name of the person/position who will address procedural barriers throughout the implementation of the grant, the date of review and status of a LEA board policy, practices and procedures, and the date of review and status of SIG school handbooks.</p>			
<b>Sustainability</b>			
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a detailed plan to provide additional funding resources that it will allocate to its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools to sustain reforms after the grant has expired.</p> <p>The LEA provides additional measures that it will take to continue reform after the life of the grant.</p> <p>The LEA provides a plan to gather and share effective practices from school receiving SIG funding to extend practices to other low-performing schools.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a plan to provide additional funding resources that it will allocate to its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools to sustain reforms after the grant has expired.</p> <p>The LEA provides additional measures that it will take to continue reform after the life of the grant.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a plan to provide additional funding resources that it will allocate to its Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools to sustain reforms after the grant has expired.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provide an inadequate description of how it will sustain the reform after the grant expires.</p>



## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b>Development of Systems for Collection of SIG Data</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a description of a comprehensive system to collect formative and summative student achievement and the SIG leading indicator data.  The LEA provides a description of its process to identify programs, processes and practices that are resulting in increased student achievement and to report to results to relevant stakeholders and the public.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a description of a system to collect formative and summative assessment data to identify programs, processes and practices that are resulting in increased student achievement.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a description of a system to collect summative assessment student achievement data.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides an inadequate description of a system to collect student achievement data.

<b><i>Preparation for Implementation of Interventions.</i></b> <b><i>Number of responses indicating</i></b>	
<b>Strong = _____</b>	<b>Limited = _____</b>
<b>Moderate = _____</b>	<b>Response Not Provided = _____</b>

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b>BUDGET – Appendix D</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a 3 year budget that is realistic and of sufficient size and scope to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) activities selected by the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. The budget and budget justification templates include sufficient detail to make this determination.  Budget requests for each school do not exceed \$2 million for each year or \$6 million over the three year grant period. Budget requests are reasonable and necessary expenditures and are in compliance with Title I requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a 3 year budget to support full and effective implementation of the selected intervention model(s) activities selected by the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools. The budget and budget justification templates include sufficient detail to make this determination.  Budget requests for each school do not exceed \$2 million for each year or \$6 million over the three year grant period. Budget requests are reasonable and necessary expenditures and are in compliance with Title I requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a 3 year budget to support activities fully and effectively.  Budget requests for each school do not exceed \$2 million for each year or \$6 million over the three year grant period. Budget requests are reasonable and necessary expenditures and are in compliance with Title I requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a budget that is insufficient to implement the activities fully and effectively, and/or lacks detail to make this determination.  Budget requests for each school exceed \$2 million for each year or \$6 million over the three year grant period.  Budget requests are not in compliance with Title I requirements.
<b>Budget Justification</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> All items listed in the LEA and schools' budget are substantiated in the budget justification templates.  Budget justifications include alignment with school goals and support for action steps described in the school's improvement plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> All items listed in the LEA and schools' budget are substantiated in the budget justification templates.  Budget justifications include alignment with school goals and some support for action steps described in the school's	<input type="checkbox"/> All items listed in the LEA and schools' budgets are substantiated in the budget justification templates.  Budget justifications include alignment with school goals some support for action steps described in the school's improvement plan.	<input type="checkbox"/> Items in the LEA and schools' budgets are not sufficiently substantiated in the budget justification template.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

---

Budget justifications provide specific detail for additional funding sources and activities.	improvement plan.  Budget justifications provide specific detail for additional funding sources and activities.		
--	---	--	--

<b>Budget</b> Number of responses indicating:
Strong = _____ -
Moderate = _____
Limited = _____
Response Not Provided = _____

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

### Section II– School Level Descriptive Information: Complete a rubric for each school that the LEA intends to serve.

LEA Name:		School Name:	
<b>Strong</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Not Provided</b>
<b><i>Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III – Summary of Comprehensive Needs Assessment</i></b>			
Review the needs assessment component of each of the Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools.			
<b>Student Profile Data</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> There is ample discussion and analysis of student profile data.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient discussion and analysis of student profile data	<input type="checkbox"/> There is limited discussion and analysis of student profile data	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an inadequate discussion and analysis of student profile data
<b>Staff Profile Data</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> There is ample discussion and analysis of staff profile data.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient discussion and analysis of staff profile data	<input type="checkbox"/> There is limited discussion and analysis of staff profile data	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an inadequate discussion and analysis of staff profile data
<b>Student Achievement Data – Reading/Language Arts</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> LEA provided every test taker (ETT) data and subgroup data for two years. There is ample discussion and analysis of needs in reading/language arts.	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA provided “ETT” data and subgroup data for two years. There is sufficient discussion and analysis of needs in reading/language arts.	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA provided “ETT” data and subgroup data for two years. There is limited discussion and analysis of reading/language arts data.	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA did not provide ETT and subgroup data. There is an inadequate discussion and analysis of reading/language arts data.
<b>Student Achievement Data – Mathematics</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> LEA provided “ETT” data and subgroup data for two years. There is ample discussion and analysis of mathematics data.	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA provided “ETT” data and subgroup data for two years. There is sufficient discussion and analysis of mathematics data.	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA provided “ETT” data and subgroup data for two years. There is limited discussion and analysis of mathematics data.	<input type="checkbox"/> LEA did not provide ETT and subgroup data. There is an inadequate discussion and analysis of mathematics data.
<b>ACT score (if applicable)</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> There is ample discussion and analysis of needs related to ACT data.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient discussion and analysis of needs related to ACT data.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is limited discussion and analysis of needs related to ACT data.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an inadequate discussion and analysis of needs related to ACT data.
<b>School Culture and Climate</b>			
There is ample discussion and analysis of school needs related to school culture and climate.	There is sufficient discussion and analysis of needs related to school culture and climate.	There is limited discussion and analysis of needs related to school culture and climate.	There is an inadequate discussion and analysis of needs related to school culture and climate.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b><i>Rigorous Curriculum</i></b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> There is ample discussion of existing status and analysis of school needs related to provision of a rigorous curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to provision of a rigorous curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is limited discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to provision of a rigorous curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an inadequate discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to provision of a rigorous curriculum.
<b><i>Instructional Program</i></b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> There is ample discussion of existing status and analysis of current instructional program needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient discussion of existing status and analysis of current instructional program needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is limited discussion of existing status and analysis of current instructional program needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an inadequate discussion of existing status and analysis of current instructional program needs.
<b><i>Assessments</i></b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> There is ample discussion of existing status and analysis of school needs related to assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to assessments.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is limited discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to assessments.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an inadequate discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to assessments.
<b><i>Parent and Community Support</i></b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> There is ample discussion of existing status and analysis of school needs related to assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to assessments.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is limited discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to assessments.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an inadequate discussion of existing status and analysis of needs related to assessments.
<b><i>Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III – School Goals</i></b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan describes ambitious annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessment in both reading/language arts and mathematics, and graduation and/or attendance rates.  Goals are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time bound.	<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan describes ambitious annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessment in both reading/language arts and mathematics, and graduation and/or attendance rates.  Goals are measurable and time bound.	<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan describes annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessment in both reading/language arts and mathematics, and graduation and/or attendance rates.  Goals are not measurable nor time bound.	<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan does not provide annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessment in both reading/language arts and mathematics, and graduation and/or attendance rates.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b><i>Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III – Action Steps</i></b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan provides rigorous action steps that are aligned with the school goal(s) and are supported by recent research related to reform in low-performing schools.  Citations of recent research are provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan provides rigorous action steps that are aligned with the school goal(s) and are supported by recent research related to reform in low-performing schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan provides action steps that are aligned with the school goal(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> The school improvement plan does not provide action steps that are aligned with school goals.
<b><i>Selection of an Intervention Model for Tier I and Tier II Schools</i></b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a compelling and clear rationale for the selected intervention model. The rationale is based on the school's identified needs and addresses root causes of the school's low performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides an adequate rationale for the selected intervention model. The rationale is based on the school's identified needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA provides a general rationale for the selected intervention model. The alignment of the rationale with the school's identified needs is unclear.	<input type="checkbox"/> The LEA does not provide a rationale for the selected intervention model.

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

<b><i>Tier I and Tier II Schools- Design and Implementation of Intervention Models Consistent with Final Requirements</i></b> <b><i>Applicable Appendices E, F, G, H, I</i></b>				
<b>Strong</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Limited</b>	<b>Not provided</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b><i>Tier I and Tier II Turnaround Model- Appendix E</i></b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> There is significant evidence detailing a comprehensive plan for the school that will be implementing the Turnaround Model. Evidence includes detailed action steps, a timeline for implementation with corresponding quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient evidence about plans for the school that will be implementing the Turnaround Model. Evidence includes detailed action steps, a timeline for implementation with corresponding quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is some evidence about plans for the school that will be implementing the Turnaround Model. Evidence includes detailed action steps, a timeline for implementation with corresponding quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is insufficient evidence about plans for the school that will be implementing the Turnaround Model.	<input type="checkbox"/> The model is not being implemented.
<b><i>Tier I and Tier II Transformation Model- Appendix H</i></b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> There is significant evidence about a comprehensive plan for school that will be implementing the Transformation Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with corresponding quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient evidence about a plan for school that will be implementing the Transformation Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with corresponding quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is some evidence about a plan for school that will be implementing the Transformation Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with corresponding quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is insufficient evidence about plans for school that will be implementing the Transformation Model.	<input type="checkbox"/> The model is not being implemented.
<b><i>Tier I and Tier II Restart Model-Appendix F</i></b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> There is significant	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> There is some evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> There is insufficient	<input type="checkbox"/> The model is not being

## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

evidence about a comprehensive plan for the school that will be implementing the Restart Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	evidence about a plan for school that will be implementing the Restart Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	about a plan for school that will be implementing the Restart Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with quarterly milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	evidence about a plan for school that will be implementing the Restart Model.	implemented.
<b><i>Tier I and Tier II Closure Model- Appendix G</i></b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> There is significant evidence about plans for school that will be implementing the Closure Model. Evidence includes detailed action steps, a timeline for implementation with applicable milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient evidence about plans for school that will be implementing the Closure Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with applicable milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is some evidence about plans for school that will be implementing the Closure Model. Evidence includes action steps, a timeline for implementation with applicable milestones and the name of position of responsible person(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> There is insufficient evidence about plans for school that will be implementing the Closure Model.	<input type="checkbox"/> The model is not being implemented.
<b><i>Tier III Not Implementing One of the Intervention Models- Appendix I</i></b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> There is significant evidence about plans and actions the LEA has taken	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient evidence about plans and actions the LEA has	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient evidence about plans and actions the LEA has taken	<input type="checkbox"/> There is sufficient evidence about plans and actions the LEA has taken	<input type="checkbox"/> The model is not being implemented.



## Appendix B - School Improvement Grant Rubric

---

or will take to design and implement interventions to assist schools in meeting goals in Tier III schools.	taken or will take to design and implement interventions to assist schools in meeting goals in Tier III schools.	or will take to design and implement interventions to assist schools in meeting goals in Tier III schools.	or will take to design and implement interventions to assist schools in meeting goals in Tier III schools.	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Implementation:</b> Number of responses indicating:
<b>Strong</b> = _____ -
<b>Moderate</b> = _____
<b>Limited</b> = _____
<b>Response Not Provided</b> = _____

## Appendix C – External Providers

---

### Appendix C

#### External Providers (Include those being considered)

Name of External Provider	LEA or school served	School Improvement Expertise/Experience

Add rows as necessary.

## Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

### APPENDIX D – 3 YEAR BUDGET

**BUDGET:** An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve. The amount budgeted must not exceed \$2 million per year multiplied by the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.
  
- Three-year budgets (SY 2012-13, SY 2013-14, and SY 2014-15) are required for all Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools. The LEA's budget must be of sufficient size and scope to implement the intervention model or intervention selected fully for three years for each Tier I, II and III school the LEA commits to serve. Any funding for activities during the pre-implementation period must be budgeted separately but included as part of the first year of the LEA's three-year budget plan. (Appendix F, SIG Budget Spreadsheet.)
- Pre-implementation activities (Appendix F, SIG Budget Spreadsheet.) that are budgeted must meet the following criteria to be approvable:
  1. support the intervention model and allow full implementation of the model through 2012-2013 school year in addition to the pre-implementation period;
  2. be reasonable and necessary for the full and effective implementation of the selected model;
  3. have a reasonable budget to support the pre-implementation activities (alignment);
  4. address a need or needs identified by the LEA in the needs assessment;
  5. address improving student academic achievement in a persistently lowest performing school;
  6. be research-based;
  7. represent a significant reform beyond the basic educational program;
  8. be completed in the time provided for pre-implementation (timeline);
  9. be supplemental funding; and
  10. be evaluated by the LEA.
  
- Any LEA-level activities to support implementation of a school's intervention model or strategies that are funded by the grant must be reflected in the district portion of the grant budget.

School improvement budget spreadsheets (Excel format) and budget justification templates must be completed for the LEA and each school requesting funds. See Appendix F (a separate document). Both the budget and budget justification templates are necessary for the application. The budget, including pre-implementation activities, must be detailed using the TDE's budget codes and include a budget narrative fully explaining each budget line item.

## Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

### First Tab of Excel Spreadsheet: Budget Spreadsheet

#### *Revenue section*

- Line 1: Insert submission date.
- Line 4: Insert LEA name
- Line 5: Insert LEA number (three digit number)
- Beginning in column I on line 7: Click in the cell containing the text “(School Name)” and enter the name of one funded school receiving funds from the **SI grant**. Press the “Enter” key to display the name of the school in all other appropriate cells.
- Beginning in **Column D on line 9** (FY 11 LEA/School Status): Click in the cell and select the high priority status of the LEA from the drop-down list displayed. Click in **Column I, line 9** and select the status for each funded school from the drop-down list.
- Beginning in Column K on line 10 (FY 2011 SI Grant Award/Allocation): Insert each funded school’s budget for the year. (e.g. If your budget is \$350,000, enter “350000” and the spreadsheet will format your entry appropriately.) Repeat on line 10 in both columns L and M to display the entire three-year budget for the school.
- Enter the district portion of each school’s total award in columns E, F and G, if applicable. The spreadsheet is formatted to total the budget amount entered in columns E, F, G, J, K, L, and M. The combined total will auto-calculate on line 10 in Column D. The amount displayed in Column D, line 10 **cannot exceed the total school award** for the three-year grant period. In Column J, line 11, select the Intervention Model to be used by the displayed school. In this column, pre-implementation activities must be budgeted. The pre-implementation budget is part of the school’s year 1 budget. Therefore, Columns J and K should equal the year 1 budget total. Column I will sum the total year 1 budget.

#### *Appropriations section*

*The first two columns are “frozen” so you can scroll over to the appropriate column for each year’s budget and have the descriptions right next to the cells where you **enter the budgeted amounts**.*

- **Lines 19-174:** Insert proposed appropriations for the district and the funded school. (e.g. district-wide are expenses such as teachers who provide district-wide services) Each category’s sub-total will automatically calculate.  
Enter the pre-implementation activities for Year One in the darker column preceding the year 1 budget.

**Line 13, Check cell:** Look to see that the budget minus expenditures equals zero.

### Second Tab of Excel Spreadsheet: Budget Justification Templates

There are four (4) areas of budget justification templates that must be completed: 1) Field Experiences; 2) Professional Development; 3) Personnel; and 4) Equipment, Materials, Services, and Other Resources. Expenditure explanations will be completed on the corresponding budget justification sheet.

## Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

---

- At the top of the sheet, enter the LEA name.
- Press the “Tab” key to go to the next column, as is possible throughout the form.
- Enter the name of the School Improvement Coordinator.
- On the next line, enter the school and date in the spaces provided.
- Enter the TSIP goal and number of the goal and action step(s) that provide the justification for the activities being funded on the budget justification form. *Be sure to include only one goal per sheet.* There are 3 budget justification sheets for each area for up to 3 goals, if needed.
- Complete the justification cells for those items requested for School Year 2012-13 of the grant. Be sure to give all information requested.
- The first column of the sheet is Yes/No to indicate pre-implementation activities. Be sure to include any budgeted pre-implementation activities on the appropriate budget justification sheet.
- The final column requires the TDE budget category where the item is located in the budget.
- One column will total the amount of SIG funds allocated at the bottom of the page.
- Be sure all items budgeted in the 4 budget justification areas for School Year 2012-13 are reflected on the budget justification sheets.

## Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

1 Submission Date

### Appendix D

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name

5 LEA #

	School Improvement Grant 1003(g) 2012-2015	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2013-2014	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2014-2015	(School Name) Total Year 1 - Pre-Implementation and Implementation	(School Name) SIG: Pre-Implementation Budget 2012	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2012-2013	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2013-2014	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2014-2015
9 FY11 LEA/School Status									
10 FY 2011 SI Grant Award/Allocation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
11 If Tier I or Tier II school, model being implemented:									
12									
13 Check: should be zero (Award/Allocation minus Expenditures)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

#### Appropriations

Account Number/ Line Item Number	REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL EDUCATION	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2013-2014	(School Name) Total Year 1 - Pre-Implementation and Implementation	(School Name) SIG: Pre-Implementation Budget 2011-2012	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2012-2013	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2013-2014	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2014-2015
71100	Line Item Description									
18 71100 / 116	Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
19 71100 / 117	Career Ladder Program	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
20 71100 / 127	Career Ladder Extended Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
21 71100 / 128	Homebound Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
22 71100 / 162	Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
23 71100 / 163	Educational Assistants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
24 71100 / 189	Other Salaries & Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
25 71100 / 195	Certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
26 71100 / 198	Non-certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
27 71100 / 201	Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
28 71100 / 204	State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29 71100 / 206	Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
30 71100 / 207	Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
31 71100 / 208	Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32 71100 / 210	Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
33 71100 / 212	Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
34 71100 / 299	Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
35 71100 / 311	Contracts with Other School Systems	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
36 71100 / 330	Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
37 71100 / 336	Maintenance & Repair Services - Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
38 71100 / 356	Tuition	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
39 71100 / 369	Contracts for Substitute Teachers -Certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
40 71100 / 370	Contracts for Substitute Teachers Non-certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
41 71100 / 399	Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
42 71100 / 429	Instructional Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
43 71100 / 449	Textbooks	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
44 71100 / 499	Other Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
45 71100 / 535	Fee Waivers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
46 71100 / 599	Other Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
47 71100 / 722	Regular Instruction Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
48										
49 71100	Subtotal REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL EDUCATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

1 Submission Date

Appendix D

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name

5 LEA #

Account Number/ Line Item Number	SUPPORT SERVICE/S/ OTHER STUDENT SUPPORT	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2013-2014	(School Name) Total Year 1 - Pre- Implementation and Implementation	(School Name) SIG: Pre- Implementation Budget 2011-2012	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2012-2013	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2013-2014	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2014-2015
89	72130 Line Item Description									
90	72130 / 117 Career Ladder Program	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
91	72130 / 123 Guidance Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
92	72130 / 124 Psychological Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
93	72130 / 127 Career Ladder - Extended Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
94	72130 / 130 Social Workers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
95	72130 / 135 Assessment Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
96	72130 / 161 Secretary(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
97	72130 / 162 Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
98	72130 / 164 Attendants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
99	72130 / 170 School Resource Officer	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
100	72130 / 189 Other Salaries & Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
101	72130 / 201 Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
102	72130 / 204 State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
103	72130 / 206 Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
104	72130 / 207 Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
105	72130 / 208 Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
106	72130 / 210 Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
107	72130 / 212 Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
108	72130 / 299 Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
109	72130 / 307 Communication	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
110	72130 / 309 Contracts with Government Agencies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
111	72130 / 311 Contracts with Other School Systems	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
112	72130 / 322 Evaluation & Testing	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
113	72130 / 330 Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
114	72130 / 336 Maintenance & Repair Services - Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
115	72130 / 348 Postal Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
116	72130 / 355 Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
117	72130 / 399 Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
118	72130 / 499 Other Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
119	72130 / 524 In-Service/Staff Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
120	72130 / 599 Other Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
121	72130 / 790 Other Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
122										
123	72130 Subtotal OTHER STUDENT SUPPORT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00



Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

1 Submission Date

Appendix D

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name

5 LEA #

Account Number/ Line Item Number	REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM SUPPORT SERVICES	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2013-2014	(School Name) Total Year 1 - Pre-Implementation and Implementation	(School Name) SIG: Pre-Implementation Budget 2011-2012	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2012-2013	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2013-2014	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2014-2015
72210	Line Item Description									
126	72210 / 105 Supervisor/Director	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
127	72210 / 117 Career Ladder Program	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
128	72210 / 127 Career Ladder Extended Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
129	72210 / 129 Librarian(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
130	72210 / 132 Material Supervisor(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
131	72210 / 136 Audiovisual Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
132	72210 / 137 Education Media Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
133	72210 / 138 Instructional Computer Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
134	72210 / 161 Secretary(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
135	72210 / 162 Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
136	72210 / 163 Educational Assistants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
137	72210 / 169 Other Salaries & Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
138	72210 / 195 Certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
139	72210 / 196 In-Service Training	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
140	72210 / 198 Non-certified Substitute Teachers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
141	72210 / 201 Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
142	72210 / 204 State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
143	72210 / 206 Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
144	72210 / 207 Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
145	72210 / 208 Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
146	72210 / 210 Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
147	72210 / 212 Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
148	72210 / 299 Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
149	72210 / 307 Communication	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
150	72210 / 308 Consultants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
151	72210 / 330 Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
152	72210 / 336 Maintenance & Repair Services - Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
153	72210 / 348 Postal Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
154	72210 / 355 Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
155	72210 / 389 Contracts for Substitute Teachers -Certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
156	72210 / 370 Contracts for Substitute Teachers Non-certified	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
157	72210 / 399 Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
158	72210 / 432 Library Books/Media	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
159	72210 / 437 Periodicals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
160	72210 / 499 Other Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
161	72210 / 524 In-Service/Staff Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
162	72210 / 599 Other Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
163	72210 / 790 Other Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
164	72210									
165	Subtotal REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL PROG-SUPPORT SVS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
166										

Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

1 Submission Date

Appendix D

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name

5 LEA #

Account Number/ Line Item Number	SUPPORT SERVICE S/ TRANSPORTATION	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2013-2014	(School Name) Total Year 1 - Pre- Implementation and Implementation	(School Name) SIG: Pre- Implementation Budget 2011-2012	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2012-2013	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2013-2014	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2014-2015
72710	Line Item Description									
206	Supervisor/Director	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
207	Mechanic(s)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
208	Bus Drivers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
209	Clerical Personnel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
210	Other Salaries & Wages	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
211	In-Service Training	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
212	Social Security	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
213	State Retirement	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
214	Life Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
215	Medical Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
216	Dental Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
217	Unemployment Compensation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
218	Employer Medicare	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
219	Other Fringe Benefits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
220	Communication	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
221	Contracts with Other School Systems	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
222	Contracts with Private Agencies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
223	Contracts with Parents	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
224	Contracts with Public Carriers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
225	Contracts with Vehicle Owners	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
226	Laundry Service	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
227	Operating Lease Payments	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
228	Maintenance & Repair Service-Vehicles	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
229	Medical and Dental Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
230	Postal Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
231	Rentals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
232	Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
233	Other Contracted Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
234	Diesel Fuel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
235	Equipment & Machinery Parts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
236	Garage Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
237	Gasoline	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
238	Lubricants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
239	Tires & Tubes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
240	Vehicle Parts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
241	Other Supplies & Materials	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
242	Vehicle & Equipment Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
243	In-Service/Staff Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
244	Other Charges	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
245	Administration Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
246	Transportation Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
247										
248										
249	Subtotal TRANSPORTATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00

Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

1 Submission Date

Appendix D

The following represents the individual budgets for federal projects administered under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

4 LEA Name

5 LEA #

Account Number/ Line Item Number	OTHER USES/ TRANSFERS OUT AND INDIRECT COST	School Improvement Grant 1003(g)	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2011-2012	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2012-2013	Districtwide School Improvement Grant Title I-1003 (g) funds 2013-2014	(School Name) Total Year 1 - Pre-Implementation and Implementation	(School Name) SIG: Pre-Implementation Budget 2011-2012	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2012-2013	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2013-2014	(School Name) SIG: Budget 2014-2015
293 99100	Line Item Description									
294 99100 / 504	Indirect Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
295 99100 / 590	Cumulative Transfers TO Other Federal Projects (INCLUDING Consolidated Administration) (Expenditure(s) FROM this Title/Project)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			0.00	0.00	0.00
296 99100	Subtotal TRANSFERS OUT AND INDIRECT COST	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
297										
298										
299	Total Appropriations	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Comments:

Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

Budget Justification for Student Field Experiences													
LEA:								School Improvement Coordinator:					
School:								Date:					
On the line below, state and provide the number of the TSIP goal that justifies the purchase of the equipment, materials, services and other resources listed below.													
TSIP Goal: (Limit one goal per page)													
Date	Version	Pre-Implementation (Yes/No)	Name and Description of Activity Involving Travel	Student Group Participating	Name of School Personnel and/or Positions Who Will Supervise Students	Location of activity	Target Date/s and Duration of Trip	Amount SIG Funds Allocated	SIG Budget Category	Amount RTTT Funds	Additional Available Funds (i.e. federal, state, local and community)	Comments  (for SDE use only)	Grant Monitoring  (for SDE use only)
								\$0.00					



Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

Budget Justification for Professional Development Activities Including Travel													
LEA:							School Improvement Coordinator:						
School:							Date:						
On the line below, state and provide the number of the TSIP goal that justifies the purchase of the equipment, materials, services and other resources listed below.													
TSIP Goal: (Limit one goal per page)													
Date	Version	Pre-implementation (Yes/No)	Title and Brief Description of Professional Development Activity	Person/s or Agency Responsible for Activity Delivery and Support	Target Audience List Persons and/or Positions Who Will Receive Training.	Target Date/s and Duration of Activity	Follow-Up Activities, Dates, Attendees	Travel Involved for Attendees (Yes/No)	Amount SIG Funds Allocated	SIG Budget Category	Amount RTTT Funds	Additional Available Funds (i.e. federal, state, local and community)	Comments (for SDE use only)

Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

Budget Justification for Personnel for School Improvement Grant												
LEA:						School Improvement Coordinator:						
School:						Date:						
On the line below, state and provide the number of the TSIP goal that justifies the purchase of the equipment, materials, services and other resources listed below.												
TSIP Goal: (Limit one goal per page)												
Date	Version	Pre-Implementation YES or NO	Position Title	Number of Persons in Position and the Grade Level/s Impacted	Contract Position (Yes/No)	Duties/Responsibilities <i>(Job description must be on file)</i>	Amount SIG Funds Allocated (Salary with Benefits)	SIG Budget Category	Amount RTTT Funds	Additional Available Funds (i.e. federal, state, local and community)	Comments <i>(for SDE use only)</i>	Grant Monitoring <i>(for SDE use only)</i>

Appendix D – 3 Year Budget

Budget Justification for Equipment, Materials, Services and Other Resources													
LEA:						School Improvement Coordinator:							
School:						Date:							
On the line below, state and provide the number of the TSIP goal that justifies the purchase of the equipment, materials, services and other resources listed below.													
TSIP Goal: (Limit one goal per page)													
Date	Version	Pre-Implementation YES or NO	List Equipment, Materials, Services and Other Resources	Total Number of Items	Personnel or Student Groups Who Will Use Items	Title of Training to be Provided <i>(Specifics of training should be addressed on Budget Justification for Professional Development page)</i>	Person/s Responsible for Training	Person Responsible for Tracking and Use	Amount SIG Funds Allocated	SIG Budget Category	Amount RTTT Funds	Additional Available Funds (i.e. federal, state, local and community)	Comments <i>(for SDE use only)</i>



## Appendix E

### Appendix E SCHOOL COVER SHEET - Turnaround Model

<b>School Name:</b> <b>Address:</b>	<b>District Point of Contact (POC)</b> <b>Name &amp; Position:</b>  <b>Phone#:</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	
<b>School Number:</b>	<b>Number of Students Enrolled (SY 2011-2012):</b>	
<b>Grade levels enrolled (SY 2011-12):</b>		
<b>Year the school entered school improvement status: _____</b>	<b>Tier Level</b> <b>Tier I</b> _____ <b>Tier II</b> _____ <b>Tier III</b> _____	
<b>Principal's Name SY 2012-13:</b> (Indicate <i>TBD</i> if unknown at this time.)  <b>Phone #</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	<b>School Improvement Status</b> _____ <b>Good Standing</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 1</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 2</b> _____ <b>Corrective Action</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 1</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 2/ Alt. Governance</b> _____ <b>State/LEA Reconstitution</b>	
<b>Title I Status:</b> _____ <b>Schoolwide Program</b> _____ <b>Targeted Assistance Program</b> _____ <b>Title I Eligible School</b>	<b>Intervention Model Selected (Tier I or II, III)</b> _____ <b>Turnaround Model</b>	
<b>Waiver Request(s):</b>  _____ <b>Requested for this School</b>  _____ <b>Not Requested for this School</b>	<b>Amount the LEA is requesting from SY 2012-13 School Improvement Funds for the next three years for this school*:</b>  <b>* Each year--not to exceed \$2 million</b>	
	<b>Pre-Implementation Activities Year 1</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 1: SY 2012-13 excluding pre-implementation</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 2: SY 2013-14</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 3: SY 2014-15</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Three Year Total Budget</b>	<b>\$</b>

## Appendix E

### School Level Descriptive Information

#### ***School Comprehensive Needs Analysis:***

1. Using the analysis of the data in the areas below, provide a summary and conclusion for each of the areas as indicated.  
Using the needs assessment, each LEA is required to select an intervention for each school.

<b>Name:</b>			<b>Tier:</b>	<b>Intervention Model</b>
Provide a minimum of two years of data where indicated.			Provide a summary and conclusion of the analysis of each area.	
<b>1. Student Profile Data</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>		
Total student enrollment				
Grade level enrollment				
Number of students in each subgroup (List applicable subgroups below)				
Mobility % - Entrants, Withdrawals				
Attendance %				
Suspensions				
Expulsions				
Dual enrollment and/or Advance Placement enrollment				
Graduation Rate				
<b>2. Staff Profile Data</b>	Provide a summary and conclusion of the analysis of each area.			
Principal Length of time in position				
Teaching Staff Number and % of experience in profession 1. 6-10 years 2. 11-15 years 3. 16-20 years 4. 21+ years				

## Appendix E

Teaching Staff Number and % of experience in the school 1. 6-10 years 2. 11-15 years 3. 16-20 years 4. 21+ years			
Teacher attendance rate	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	
Teacher evaluation composite data for tested subjects and grades		<b>2010-2011</b>	
Teacher observation data			Narrate general trends of current observational data.
<b>3. Student Achievement Data</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>			
“Every test taker” (ETT) category			
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender			
School performance on value-added student achievement			
<b>Mathematics</b>			
“Every test taker” (ETT) category			
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students			

## Appendix E

English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender ( if available)			
<b>ACT scores (if applicable)</b>			
<b>4. School Culture and Climate</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		
TELL Survey Analysis  School Safety  Student Health Services  Attendance Support  Social and Community Support  Parent Support			
<b>5. Rigorous Curriculum-</b> Alignment of curriculum with state standards across grade levels	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		
Curriculum Intervention Programs			
Enrichment Programs			
Dual enrollment (if applicable)			
Advanced Placement (if applicable)			
<b>6. Instructional Program</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		
Planning and implementation of research based instructional strategies			
Use of instructional technology			
Use of data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction			
Number of minutes scheduled for core academic subjects			

## Appendix E

<b>7. Assessments</b>	
Use of formative, interim, and summative assessments to measure student progress	
Timeline for reporting student progress to parents	
<b>8. Parent and Community Support</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
Social and community services to students and families	
Parent support to students and school	

### 2. Annual Goals for Student Achievement for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools

Based comprehensive needs assessment of each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school the LEA will serve, establish the annual goals for student achievement on the most recent TDE assessments in **both reading/language arts and mathematics AND applicable graduation or attendance rate**.

For each school the LEA intends to serve, provide in an attachment (label as Attachment 1),

- a. A copy of the most recently revised Tennessee School Improvement Plan (TSIP) Component 4,

**OR**

- b. the “streamlined” improvement plan developed in Fall 2011, Revised Tennessee School and District Improvement Planning document.

## Appendix E

### Turnaround Model

<b>School Name:</b> <input type="text"/>	<b>Tier:</b> <input type="text"/>
Rationale for selection of intervention model: Explain how the LEA will use the turnaround intervention model to address the root causes of the school's low-performance as identified in the school's needs assessment.	
If the LEA has begun in whole or in part a turnaround intervention model within the past two years, and wished to continue, describe the actions that have been taken up to the present that are relative to the turnaround requirements. Cite evidence of the impact of the model on the school to date.	
Annual Goals for Reading/Language Arts on State assessments for "all students" group and for each subgroup. SY 2012:  SY 2013:  SY 2014:	
Quarterly Milestone Goals for Reading/Language Arts on interim assessments for "all students" group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> ( to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)	

## Appendix E

---

Annual Goals for Mathematics on State assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup.

SY 2012:

SY 2013:

SY 2014:

Quarterly Milestone Goals for Mathematics on interim assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup for **SY 2011 only** (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant).

Annual Goals for “other academic indicator,” high school graduation rate or attendance in middle and elementary schools.

SY 2012:

SY 2013:

SY 2014:

Quarterly Milestone Goals for “other academic indicator” all students” group and for each subgroup for **SY 2011 only** (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)



## Appendix E

<b>Name of School:</b>		<b>Tier:</b>	
<b>Turnaround Model</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Timeline for Implementation</b>	<b>Name and Position of Responsible Person(s)</b>
<b>LEA Design and Implementation of the Intervention Model for Each Year of Grant</b>	<b>Note: Pre-implementation activities for Year One must be addressed in the chart at the end of this model.</b>		

<b>Requirements for the Turnaround Model (LEA <u>must</u> implement actions 1-9.)</b>			
1a. Replace the principal 1b. Grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates			
2. Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and (B) Select new staff			
3. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for			

## Appendix E

promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school			
4. Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies			
5. Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability			
6. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards			

## Appendix E

7. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students			
8. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time as defined in the SIG final requirements.			
9. Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.			
<b>Permissible Strategies for the Implementation of the Turnaround Model.</b> <i>LEA may implement any of the required and permissible under the transformation model (See Appendix H) or design a new school model (e.g. themed academies, program to address health and social-emotional issues of high need children, etc.) Add rows as necessary.</i>			

## Appendix E

### Turnaround Model: Pre-Implementation Activities

Please note: The activity categories listed below are not an exhaustive or required list. Rather, they illustrate possible activities that the LEA may list, depending on the needs of the school.

#### **Pre-Implementation Activities:**

Pre-Implementation allows the LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2012-2013 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application consistent with SIG final requirements.

To help in its preparation, as soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG related activities in schools that will be served with federal FY 2010 SIG funds.

Activities must align to schools' needs assessment and requirements of the intervention model; represent change; be reasonable, necessary, and allowable; be researched-based; and be implemented prior to the beginning of the 2012-2013 academic school year.

#### **Activity Categories with Sample Activities:**

***Family and Community Engagement:*** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by

Using a list format, provide a brief description of each pre-implementation activity. Each activity must support a TSIPP goal and action step and must be included in the school's budget and budget justification.

## Appendix E

*providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.*

***Rigorous Review of External Providers:*** *Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.*

***Staffing:*** *Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.*

***Instructional Programs:*** *Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2012-2013 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.*

***Professional Development and Support:*** *Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observation of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.*

## Appendix E

***Preparation for Accountability Measures:*** *Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.*

**Professional Development:**

Ongoing professional development, including job-embedded training designed to build capacity and support staff, is an integral part of successful school reform. While no specific amount of SIG funds are required for professional development, plans for professional development to be provided through SIG must be included in TSIPP Component 4 (goals, actions steps, and implementation plans). This includes literacy and mathematics training for the staff unless the school demonstrates proficiency in this area.

Who in the LEA will ensure implementation of professional development plans with SIG funds?

Provide this school's PD plan including topics and projected dates.

## Appendix F

### Appendix F-SCHOOL COVER SHEET – Restart Model

<b>School Name:</b> <b>Address:</b>	<b>District Point of Contact (POC)</b> <b>Name &amp; Position:</b>  <b>Phone#:</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	
<b>School Number:</b>	<b>Number of Students Enrolled (SY 2011-2012):</b>	
<b>Grade levels enrolled (SY 2011-12):</b>		
<b>Year the school entered school improvement status:</b> _____	<b>Tier Level</b> <b>Tier I</b> _____ <b>Tier II</b> _____ <b>Tier III</b> _____	
<b>Principal's Name SY 2012-13:</b> (Indicate <i>TBD</i> if unknown at this time.)  <b>Phone #</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	<b>School Improvement Status</b> _____ <b>Good Standing</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 1</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 2</b> _____ <b>Corrective Action</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 1</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 2/ Alt. Governance</b> _____ <b>State/LEA Reconstitution</b>	
<b>Title I Status:</b> _____ <b>Schoolwide Program</b> _____ <b>Targeted Assistance Program</b> _____ <b>Title I Eligible School</b>	<b>Intervention Model Selected (Tier I or II, III)</b> _____ <b>Restart Model</b>	
<b>Waiver Request(s):</b>  _____ <b>Requested for this School</b>  _____ <b>Not Requested for this School</b>	<b>Amount the LEA is requesting from SY 2012-13 School Improvement Funds for the next three years for this school*:</b>  <b>* Each year--not to exceed \$2 million</b>	
	<b>Pre-Implementation Activities Year 1</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 1: SY 2012-13 excluding pre-implementation</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 2: SY 2013-14</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 3: SY 2014-15</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Three Year Total Budget</b>	<b>\$</b>



## Appendix F

### School Level Descriptive Information

#### ***School Comprehensive Needs Analysis:***

Using the analysis of the data in the areas below, provide a summary and conclusion for each of the areas as indicated.  
Using the needs assessment, each LEA is required to select an intervention for each school.

<b>School Name:</b>			<b>Tier:</b>	<b>Intervention Model</b>
Provide a minimum of two years of data.			Provide a summary and conclusion of the analysis of each area.	
<b>1. Student Profile Data</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>		
Total student enrollment				
Grade level enrollment				
Number of students in each subgroup (List applicable subgroups below)				
Mobility % - Entrants, Withdrawals				
Attendance %				
Suspensions				
Expulsions				
Dual enrollment and/or Advanced Placement enrollment				
Graduation Rate				
<b>2. Staff Profile Data</b>	Provide a summary and conclusion of the analysis of each area.			
Principal Length of time in position				
Teaching Staff Number and % of experience in profession 1. 6-10 years 2. 11-15 years 3. 16-20 years 4. 21+ years				
Teaching Staff Number and % of experience in the school 1. 6-10 years				

## Appendix F

2. 11-15 years 3. 16-20 years 4. 21+ years			
Teacher attendance rate	2009-2010	2010-2011	
Teacher evaluation composite data for tested subjects and grades		2010-2011	
Teacher observation data			Narrate general trends of current observational data.
<b>3. Student Achievement Data</b>	2009-2010	2010-2011	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
“Every test taker” (ETT) category			
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender;			
School performance on value-added student achievement			
ACT scores (if applicable)			
<b>4. School Culture and Climate</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		
TELL Survey  School Safety  Student Health Services  Attendance Support  Family and Community Support			
<b>5. Rigorous Curriculum-</b> Alignment of curriculum with state standards across grade levels	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		

## Appendix F

Core English or Reading/Language Arts program	
Core Mathematics and Algebra I programs	
Curriculum Intervention Programs	
Enrichment Programs	
<b>6. Instructional Program</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
Planning and implementation of research based instructional strategies	
Use of instructional technology	
Use of data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction	
Number of minutes scheduled for core academic subjects	
<b>7. Assessments</b>	
Use of formative, interim, and summative assessments to measure student progress	
Timeline for reporting student progress to parents	
<b>8. Parent and Community Support</b>	
Social and community services to students and families	
Parent support to students and school	

### 2. Annual Goals for Student Achievement for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools

Based comprehensive needs assessment of each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school the LEA will serve, establish the annual goals for student achievement on the most recent TDE assessments in **both reading/language arts and mathematics AND applicable graduation or attendance rate**.

For each school the LEA intends to serve, provide in an attachment (label as Attachment 1),

- c. A copy of the most recently revised Tennessee School Improvement Plan (TSIP) Component 4,

**OR**

- d. the “streamlined” improvement plan developed in Fall 2011, Revised Tennessee School and District Improvement Planning document.

## Restart Model

<b>School Name:</b>	<b>Tier:</b>
Rationale for selection of intervention model: Explain how the LEA will use the restart intervention model to address the root causes of the school's low-performance as identified in the school's needs assessment.	
Annual Goals for Reading/Language Arts on State assessments for "all students" group and for each subgroup. SY 2012:  SY 2013:  SY 2014:	
Quarterly Milestone Goals for Reading/Language Arts on interim assessments for "all students" group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> ( to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)	
Annual Goals for Mathematics on State assessments for "all students" group and for each subgroup. SY 2012:  SY 2013:  SY 2014:	

Quarterly Milestone Goals for Mathematics on interim assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant).
Annual Goals for “other academic indicator,” high school graduation rate or attendance in middle and elementary schools.  SY 2012:  SY 2013:  SY 2014:
Quarterly Milestone Goals for “other academic indicator” all students” group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)

LEA Design and Implementation of the Intervention Model for Each Year of the Grant	Action Steps as described in LEA Design and Implementation of the Model	Timeline for Implementation	Name and Position of Person(s) Responsible
Identified Need from Assessment	Note: Pre-implementation activities for Year One must be addressed in chart at end of this model.		
<b>Description of LEA's Restart Process</b> Indicate which steps have been completed to date and which will be completed prior to the school year.			

### Restart Pre-Implementation Activities

Please note: The activity categories listed below are not an exhaustive or required list. Rather, they illustrate possible activities that the LEA may list, depending on the needs of the school.

#### **Pre-Implementation Activities:**

Pre-Implementation allows the LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2012-2013 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application consistent with SIG final requirements.

To help in its preparation, as soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG related activities in schools that will be served with federal FY 2010 SIG funds.

Activities must align to schools' needs assessment and requirements of the intervention model; represent change; be reasonable, necessary, and allowable; be researched-based; and be implemented prior to the beginning of the 2012-2013 academic school year.

#### **Activity Categories with Sample Activities:**

***Family and Community Engagement:*** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is

**In a list format, provide a description of how the LEA will use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its newly identified SIG schools. Include the cost for each activity. Items in this section must be included in the Budget/Budget Justifications.**

In a list format, provide a brief description of each pre-implementation activity. Each activity must support a TSIPP goal and action step and must be included in the school's budget and budget justification

*implementing the closure model.*

***Rigorous Review of External Providers:*** *Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.*

***Staffing:*** *Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.*

***Instructional Programs:*** *Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2012-2013 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.*

***Professional Development and Support:*** *Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observation of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.*

***Preparation for Accountability Measures:*** *Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.*



<p><b>Professional Development:</b></p> <p>Ongoing professional development, including job-embedded training designed to build capacity and support staff, is an integral part of successful school reform. While no specific amount of SIG funds are required for professional development, plans for professional development to be provided through SIG must be included in TSIPP Component 4 (goals, actions steps, and implementation plans). This includes literacy and mathematics training for the staff unless the school demonstrates proficiency in this area.</p> <p>Who in the LEA will ensure implementation of professional development plans with SIG funds? <input type="text"/></p> <p>Provide this school's PD plan including topics and projected dates. <input type="text"/></p>	

## Appendix G SCHOOL COVER SHEET – Closure Model

<b>School Name:</b> <b>Address:</b>	<b>District Point of Contact (POC)</b> <b>Name &amp; Position:</b>  <b>Phone#:</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	
<b>School Number:</b>	<b>Number of Students Enrolled (SY 2011-2012):</b>	
<b>Grade levels enrolled (SY 2011-12):</b>		
<b>Year the school entered school improvement status:</b> _____	<b>Tier Level</b> <b>Tier I</b> _____ <b>Tier II</b> _____ <b>Tier III</b> _____	
<b>Principal's Name SY 2011-12</b>  <b>Phone #</b>  <b>Email Address:</b>	<b>School Improvement Status</b> _____ <b>Good Standing</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 1</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 2</b> _____ <b>Corrective Action</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 1</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 2/ Alt. Governance</b> _____ <b>State/LEA Reconstitution</b>	
<b>Title I Status:</b> _____ <b>Schoolwide Program</b> _____ <b>Targeted Assistance Program</b> _____ <b>Title I Eligible School</b>	<b>Intervention Model Selected (Tier I or II, III)</b> _____ <b>Closure Model</b>	
	<b>School/s receiving students from closed school.</b>	
<b>Waiver Request(s):</b>  _____ <b>Requested for this School</b>  _____ <b>Not Requested for this School</b>	<b>Amount the LEA is requesting from SY 2012-13 School Improvement Funds for the next three years for this school*:</b>  <b>* Each year--not to exceed \$2 million</b>	
	<b>Pre-Implementation Activities Year 1</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 1: SY 2012-13 excluding pre-implementation</b>	<b>\$</b>

## School Level Descriptive Information

1. Provide the student achievement data for the Tier I school in which the LEA will implement the Closure Model.

Student Achievement Data	2009-2010	2010-2011
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>		
“Every test taker” (ETT) category		
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender		
<b>Mathematics</b>		
“Every test taker” (ETT) category		
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender;		
<b>ACT scores (if applicable)</b>		

2. Provide evidence that the students leaving the closing school are enrolling in a receiving school/s that are higher achieving. Complete the table below for each receiving school. Duplicate, if necessary.

If the receiving schools have not yet been determined, note that the list of receiving schools and their data must be submitted to SDE before school closure moves forward.

<b>Name of Receiving School:</b>		<b>What is the proximity of the closed school to the receiving school?</b>
<b>Student Achievement Data</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>		
“Every test taker” (ETT) category		
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender		
<b>Mathematics</b>		
“Every test taker” (ETT) category		
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender;		
<b>ACT scores (if applicable)</b>		

## Appendix G--School Closure Model

<b>Name of School:</b>		<b>Tier:</b>	
<b>School Closure Model</b>  <b>LEA Design and Implementation of the Intervention Model for this Grant</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>  <b>Note: Pre-implementation activities for Year One must be included in the chart at the end of this model.</b>	<b>Timeline for Implementation</b>	<b>Name and Position of Responsible Person(s)</b>
<b>Requirements for the School Closure Model</b>			
<b>1. Identify the school for closure</b> Describe specific action steps that the LEA will take to identify the school for closure, close the school, transfer students to their receiving schools, and inform and engage all relevant stakeholders in the implementation of the closure model.			
<b>2. Identify receiving schools for students from the closed school</b> Describe specific action steps that the LEA will take to identify the receiving schools, transfer students into their receiving schools, and inform and engage all relevant stakeholders in the implementation of the closure model.			
<b>Closure Model Addendum: Pre-Implementation Activities</b>			

Please note: The activity categories listed below are not an exhaustive or required list. Rather, they illustrate possible activities that the LEA may list, depending on the needs of the school.

<p><b>Pre-Implementation Activities:</b>  Pre-Implementation allows the LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application consistent with SIG final requirements.  As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG related activities in schools that will be served with federal FY 2010 SIG funds.  Activities must align to schools' needs assessment and requirements of the intervention model; represent change; be reasonable, necessary, and allowable; be researched-based; and be implemented prior to the beginning of the 2011-2012 academic school year.  <u>Activity Categories with Sample Activities:</u>  <b>Family and Community Engagement:</b> Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.</p>	<p><b>Provide a Description of how the LEA will use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its newly identified SIG schools. Include the cost for each activity. Items in this section must be included in the Budget/Budget Justifications.</b></p>
--	--

<b>Year 1: Q1 (SY2011-12, July-Sept.)</b>	Monitoring and oversight
	How progress will be assessed



## Appendix H-SCHOOL COVER SHEET - Transformation Model

<b>School Name:</b> <b>Address:</b>	<b>District Point of Contact (POC)</b> <b>Name &amp; Position:</b>  <b>Phone#:</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	
<b>School Number:</b>	<b>Number of Students Enrolled (SY 2011-2012):</b>	
<b>Grade levels enrolled (SY 2011-12):</b>		
<b>Year the school entered school improvement status:</b> _____	<b>Tier Level</b> <b>Tier I</b> _____ <b>Tier II</b> _____ <b>Tier III</b> _____	
<b>Principal's Name SY 2012-13:</b> (Indicate <i>TBD</i> if unknown at this time.)  <b>Phone #</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	<b>School Improvement Status</b> _____ <b>Good Standing</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 1</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 2</b> _____ <b>Corrective Action</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 1</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 2/ Alt. Governance</b> _____ <b>State/LEA Reconstitution</b>	
<b>Title I Status:</b> _____ <b>Schoolwide Program</b> _____ <b>Targeted Assistance Program</b> _____ <b>Title I Eligible School</b>	<b>Intervention Model Selected (Tier I or II, III)</b> _____ <b>Transformation Model</b>	
<b>Waiver Request(s):</b>  _____ <b>Requested for this School</b>  _____ <b>Not Requested for this School</b>	<b>Amount the LEA is requesting from SY 2012-13 School Improvement Funds for the next three years for this school*:</b>  <b>* Each year--not to exceed \$2 million</b>	
	<b>Pre-Implementation Activities Year 1</b>	\$
	<b>Year 1: SY 2012-13 excluding pre-implementation</b>	\$
	<b>Year 2: SY 2013-14</b>	\$
	<b>Year 3: SY 2014-15</b>	\$
	<b>Three Year Total Budget</b>	\$

# School Level Descriptive Information

## School Comprehensive Needs Analysis:

Using the analysis of the data in the areas below, provide a summary and conclusion for each of the areas as indicated.

Using the needs assessment, each LEA is required to select an intervention for each school.

<b>Name:</b>			<b>Tier:</b>	<b>Intervention Model</b>
Provide a minimum of two years of data where indicated.			Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.	
<b>1. Student Profile Data</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>		
Total student enrollment				
Grade level enrollment				
Number of students in each subgroup (List applicable subgroups below)				
Mobility % - Entrants, Withdrawals				
Attendance %				
Suspensions				
Expulsions				
Dual enrollment and/or Advance Placement enrollment				
Graduation Rate				
<b>2. Staff Profile Data</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.			
Principal	<input type="text"/>			
Length of time in position				
Teaching Staff	<input type="text"/>			
Number and % of experience in profession				
1. 6-10 years				
2. 11-15 years				
3. 16-20 years				
4. 21+ years				
	<input type="text"/>			
Teacher attendance rate	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>		

Teacher evaluation composite data for tested subjects and grades		<b>2010-2011</b>	
Teacher observation data			Narrate general trends of current observational data.
<b>3. Student Achievement Data</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>			
“Every test taker” (ETT) category			
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender			
<b>Mathematics</b>			
“Every test taker” (ETT) category			
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender;			
<b>ACT scores (if applicable)</b>			
<b>4. School Culture and Climate</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		

TELL Survey Analysis	
School Safety	
Student Health Services	
Attendance Support	
Social and Community Support	
Parent Support	
<b>5. Rigorous Curriculum-</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
Curriculum Intervention Programs	
Enrichment Programs	
Dual enrollment (if applicable)	
Advanced Placement (if applicable)	
<b>6. Instructional Program</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
Planning and implementation of research based instructional strategies	
Use of instructional technology	
Use of data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction	
Number of minutes scheduled for core academic subjects	
<b>7. Assessments</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
Use of formative, interim, and summative assessments to measure student progress	
Timeline for reporting student progress to parents	
<b>8. Parent and Community Support</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
Social and community services to students and families	
Parent support to students and school	

--	--

## 2. Annual Goals for Student Achievement for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools

Based comprehensive needs assessment of each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school the LEA will serve, establish the annual goals for student achievement on the most recent TDE assessments in **both reading/language arts and mathematics AND applicable graduation or attendance rate.**

For each school the LEA intends to serve, provide in an attachment (label as Attachment 1),

- e. A copy of the most recently revised Tennessee School Improvement Plan (TSIP) Component 4,

**OR**

- f. the “streamlined” improvement plan developed in Fall 2011, Revised Tennessee School and District Improvement Planning document.

## Transformation Model

School Name:	Tier:
Rationale for selection of intervention model: Explain how the LEA will use the turnaround intervention model to address the root causes of the school's low-performance as identified in the school's needs assessment.	
If the LEA has begun in whole or in part a turnaround intervention model within the past two years, and wished to continue, describe the actions that have been taken up to the present that are relative to the turnaround requirements. Cite evidence of the impact of the model on the school to date.	
Annual Goals for Reading/Language Arts on State assessments for "all students" group and for each subgroup. SY 2012:  SY 2013:  SY 2014:	
Quarterly Milestone Goals for Reading/Language Arts on interim assessments for "all students" group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> ( to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)	

<p>Annual Goals for Mathematics on State assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup.</p> <p>SY 2012:</p> <p>SY 2013:</p> <p>SY 2014:</p>
<p>Quarterly Milestone Goals for Mathematics on interim assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant).</p>
<p>Annual Goals for “other academic indicator,” high school graduation rate or attendance in middle and elementary schools.</p> <p>SY 2012:</p> <p>SY 2013:</p> <p>SY 2014:</p>
<p>Quarterly Milestone Goals for “other academic indicator” all students” group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)</p>



Transformation Model Requirements  LEA Design and Implementation of the Intervention Model for Each Year of Grant	Action Steps for Model Requirements.  Note: Pre-implementation activities for Year One must be included in the chart at the end of this model.	Timeline for Implementation with Quarterly Milestone Goals for model requirements	Name and Position of Responsible Person(s)
---	--	---	--

Requirements for the Transformation Model (LEA must implement actions 1-11.)			
<i>A transformation model is one in which the LEA <u>must</u> implement each of the following strategies to <b>develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness</b>:</i>			
1. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model			
2. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that- a. Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high-school graduations rates b. Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement			
3. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high-school			

graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so			
4. Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development ( <i>e.g.</i> , regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies			
5. Implement such strategies such as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the student in a transformation school			
<i>A transformation model is one which the LEA <u>must</u> implement each of the following <b>comprehensive instructional reform strategies</b>.</i>			
6. Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and “vertically aligned” from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards			
7. Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and			

summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students			
<i>A transformation model is one which the LEA <u>must</u> implement each of the following strategies to <b>increase learning time and create community oriented schools</b>.</i>			
8. Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time as defined in the SIG final requirements.			
9. Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement			
<i>A transformation model is one which the LEA <u>must</u> implement each of the following strategies to <b>provide operational flexibility and sustained support</b>.</i>			
10. Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates			
11. Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO)			
<b>Permissible Strategies for the Implementation of the Transformation Model</b>  <i>A transformation model is one which the LEA <u>may</u> implement any of the following required strategies to:</i> <i>(Strategies #12-26)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i><b>Develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness</b></i></li> <li>• <i><b>Provide comprehensive instructional reform strategies</b></i></li> <li>• <i><b>Increase learning time and create community oriented schools</b></i></li> <li>• <i><b>Provide operational flexibility and sustained support.</b></i></li> </ul>			

12. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school			
13. Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development			
14. Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority			
15. Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective			
16. Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model			
17. Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content			
18. Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program			
19. In secondary schools-- (a) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in			

<p>advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework</p> <p>(b) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies</p> <p>(c) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or</p> <p>(d) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate</p>			
<p>20. Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments</p>			

that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs			
21. Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff			
22. Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment			
23. Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten			
24. Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA			
25. Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs			
<b>Transformation Pre-Implementation Activities</b> Please note: The activity categories listed below are not an exhaustive or required list. Rather, they illustrate possible activities that the LEA may list, depending on the needs of the school.			
<b>Pre-Implementation Activities:</b> Pre-Implementation allows the LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2012-2013 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its SIG schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application consistent with SIG final requirements. To help in its preparation, as soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG related activities in schools that will be served with		<b>In a list format, provide a description of how the LEA will use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its newly identified SIG schools. Include the cost for each activity. Items in this section must be included in the Budget/Budget Justifications.</b>  In a list format, provide a brief description of each pre-implementation activity. Each activity must support a	

<p>federal FY 2010 SIG funds.</p> <p>Activities must align to schools' needs assessment and requirements of the intervention model; represent change; be reasonable, necessary, and allowable; be researched-based; and be implemented prior to the beginning of the 2012-2013 academic school year.</p> <p><b><u>Activity Categories with Sample Activities:</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Family and Community Engagement:</i></b> Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school intervention model to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans in line with the intervention model selected; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options, and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.</p> <p><b><i>Rigorous Review of External Providers:</i></b> Conduct the required rigorous review process to select a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO and contract with that entity (see C-5); or properly recruit, screen, and select any external providers that may be necessary to assist in planning for the implementation of an intervention model.</p> <p><b><i>Staffing:</i></b> Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.</p> <p><b><i>Instructional Programs:</i></b> Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2012-2013 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase</p>	<p>TSIPP goal and action step and must be included in the school's budget and budget justification</p>
--	--



<p><i>instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.</i></p> <p><b><i>Professional Development and Support:</i></b> <i>Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observation of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.</i></p> <p><b><i>Preparation for Accountability Measures:</i></b> <i>Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.</i></p>	
<p><b>Professional Development:</b></p> <p>Ongoing professional development, including job-embedded training designed to build capacity and support staff, is an integral part of successful school reform. While no specific amount of SIG funds are required for professional development, plans for professional development to be provided through SIG must be included in TSIPP Component 4 (goals, actions steps, and implementation plans). This includes literacy and mathematics training for the staff unless the school demonstrates proficiency in this area.</p> <p>Who in the LEA will ensure implementation of professional development plans with SIG funds? <input data-bbox="1461 1247 1545 1287" type="text"/></p> <p>Provide this school's PD plan including topics and projected dates. <input data-bbox="1083 1320 1167 1360" type="text"/></p>	

## **Appendix I**

### **Tier III - School Plan of Action**

#### **LEA Design and Implementation Plan**

**Duplicate the following templates and complete one for each Tier III school that will not implement one of the four intervention models.**

The LEA should determine interventions that will be most effective in building the school's capacity to improve student achievement and move the school out of improvement status. Interventions must be based data driven and must support the school's school improvement goals as indicated in TSIP Component 4 or the Revised Tennessee School and District Improvement Planning document.

## Appendix I

### SCHOOL COVER SHEET – Tier III School Plan of Action

<b>School Name:</b> <b>Address:</b>	<b>District Point of Contact (POC)</b> <b>Name &amp; Position:</b>  <b>Phone#:</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	
<b>School Number:</b>	<b>Number of Students Enrolled (SY 2011-2012):</b>	
<b>Grade levels enrolled (SY 2011-12):</b>		
<b>Year the school entered school improvement status:</b> _____	<b>Tier Level</b> <b>Tier I</b> _____ <b>Tier II</b> _____ <b>Tier III</b> _____ <b>x</b> _____	
<b>Principal's Name SY 2012-13:</b> (Indicate <i>TBD</i> if unknown at this time.)  <b>Phone #</b> <b>Email Address:</b>	<b>School Improvement Status</b> _____ <b>Good Standing</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 1</b> _____ <b>School Improvement 2</b> _____ <b>Corrective Action</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 1</b> _____ <b>Restructuring 2/ Alt. Governance</b> _____ <b>State/LEA Reconstitution</b>	
<b>Title I Status:</b> _____ <b>Schoolwide Program</b> _____ <b>Targeted Assistance Program</b> _____ <b>Title I Eligible School</b>	<b>Intervention</b>  _____ <b>Tier III School Plan of Action</b>	
<b>Waiver Request(s):</b>  _____ <b>Requested for this School</b>  _____ <b>Not Requested for this School</b>	<b>Amount the LEA is requesting from SY 2012-13 School Improvement Funds for the next three years for this school*:</b>  <b>* Each year--not to exceed \$2 million</b>	
	<b>Pre-Implementation Activities Year 1</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 1: SY 2012-13 excluding pre-implementation</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 2: SY 2013-14</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Year 3: SY 2014-15</b>	<b>\$</b>
	<b>Three Year Total Budget</b>	<b>\$</b>

## School Level Descriptive Information

### ***School Comprehensive Needs Analysis:***

Using the analysis of the data in the areas below, provide a summary and conclusion for each of the areas as indicated.

Using the needs assessment, each LEA is required to select an intervention for each school.

<b>Name:</b>			<b>Tier:</b>
Provide a minimum of two years of data where indicated.			Provide a summary and conclusion of the analysis of each area.
<b>1. Student Profile Data</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	
Total student enrollment			
Grade level enrollment			
Number of students in each subgroup (List applicable subgroups below)			
Mobility % - Entrants, Withdrawals			
Attendance %			
Suspensions			
Expulsions			
Dual enrollment and/or Advance Placement enrollment			
Graduation Rate			
<b>2. Staff Profile Data</b>	Provide a summary and conclusion of the analysis of each area.		
Principal Length of time in position			
Teaching Staff Number and % of experience in profession 1. 6-10 years 2. 11-15 years 3. 16-20 years 4. 21+ years			

Teaching Staff Number and % of experience in the school 1. 6-10 years 2. 11-15 years 3. 16-20 years 4. 21+ years			
Teacher attendance rate	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	
Teacher evaluation composite data for tested subjects and grades		<b>2010-2011</b>	
Teacher observation data			Narrate general trends of current observational data.
<b>3. Student Achievement Data</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
<b>Reading/Language Arts</b>			
“Every test taker” (ETT) category			
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups Gender			
<b>Mathematics</b>			
“Every test taker” (ETT) category			
Subgroups: Economically disadvantaged students, Special education students English Language Learners (ELL) Race/ethnicity subgroups			

Gender;			
<b>ACT scores (if applicable)</b>			
<b>4. School Culture and Climate</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		
TELL Survey Analysis School Safety Student Health Services Attendance Support Social and Community Support Parent Support			
<b>5. Rigorous Curriculum-</b> Alignment of curriculum with state standards across grade levels	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		
Curriculum Intervention Programs			
Enrichment Programs			
Dual enrollment (if applicable)			
Advanced Placement (if applicable)			
<b>6. Instructional Program</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.		
Planning and implementation of research based instructional strategies			
Instructional technology			
Use of data analysis to inform and differentiate instruction			

Number of minutes scheduled for core academic subjects	
<b>7. Assessments</b>	
Use of formative, interim, and summative assessments to measure student progress	
Timeline for reporting student progress to parents	
<b>8. Parent and Community Support</b>	Provide a summary of existing status and current needs.
Social and community services to students and families	
Parent support to students and school	

## 2. Annual Goals for Student Achievement for Tier I, Tier II and Tier III schools

Based comprehensive needs assessment of each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school the LEA will serve, establish the annual goals for student achievement on the most recent TDE assessments in **both reading/language arts and mathematics AND applicable graduation or attendance rate.**

For each school the LEA intends to serve, provide in an attachment (label as Attachment 1),

g. A copy of the most recently revised Tennessee School Improvement Plan (TSIP) Component 4,

**OR**

h. the “streamlined” improvement plan developed in Fall 2011, Revised Tennessee School and District Improvement Planning document.

### **Tier III School Plan of Action:**

The following information should be included in the plan of action *for each intervention selected*.

- 1. Intervention Activities:** List the intervention activities the school will implement.
- 2. When will it occur? Timeline for Implementation with Quarterly Milestones for Year 1:** The LEA must provide an implementation plan including quarterly milestone goals for each year and a three-year timeline. Pre-implementation activities for Year One must be included in the Year One timeline
- 3. How will the effectiveness of this intervention be determined?** LEAs should discuss:
  - What assessments (formative, interim, and summative) will be used to determine if the selected intervention/activities has been effective?
  - What other evaluation tool will be used to determine effectiveness of the intervention/activities?
  - How often will the intervention/activities be monitored or assessed for effectiveness?
- 4. Who will monitor and evaluate the implementation?** The District School Improvement Team should have the responsibility for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of this grant in Tier III schools. The Title I Office should be represented on this team.
- 5. Who is taking the lead and who will participate?** Schools will provide the names of all lead persons and participants. The principal must always be included. Renewal schools must indicate if lead persons are representative of the Whole School Reform provider.



Tier III Schools-- Plan of Action	
School Name and Number:	Tier:
<p>Annual Goals for Reading/Language Arts on State assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup.</p> <p>SY 2012:</p> <p>SY 2013:</p> <p>SY 2014:</p>	
<p>Quarterly Milestone Goals for Reading/Language Arts on interim assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> ( to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)</p>	
<p>Annual Goals for Mathematics on State assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup.</p> <p>SY 2012:</p> <p>SY 2013:</p> <p>SY 2014:</p>	

Quarterly Milestone Goals for Mathematics on interim assessments for “all students” group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant).
<p>Annual Goals for “other academic indicator,” high school graduation rate or attendance in middle and elementary schools.</p> <p>SY 2012:</p> <p>SY 2013:</p> <p>SY 2014:</p>
Quarterly Milestone Goals for “other academic indicator” all students” group and for each subgroup for <b><u>SY 2011 only</u></b> (to be updated annually upon renewal of the grant)

Intervention Activity	Timeline for Implementation for Each Year of Grant With Quarterly Milestones for Year 1  <i>Note: Pre-implementation activities must be included in the chart at the end of this section.</i>	How will the effectiveness of this intervention be determined?	Who will monitor and evaluate the implementation?	Who is taking the lead and who will participate?

<p><b>Tier III Pre-Implementation Activities:</b> Please note: The activity categories listed below are not an exhaustive or required list. Rather, they illustrate possible activities that the LEA may list, depending on the needs of the school.</p> <p>Pre-Implementation allows the LEA to prepare for full implementation of a school intervention model at the start of the 2012-2013 school year. To help in its preparation, an LEA may use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its SIG</p>	<p><b>In a list format, provide a description of how the LEA will use federal FY 2010 SIG funds in its newly identified SIG schools. Include the cost for each activity. Items in this section must be included in the Budget/Budget Justifications.</b></p> <p>In a list format, provide a brief description of each pre-implementation activity. Each activity must support a TSIPP goal and action step and must be included in the school's budget and budget justification</p>
--	---

schools after the LEA has been awarded a SIG grant for those schools based on having a fully approvable application consistent with SIG final requirements.

As soon as it receives the funds, the LEA may use part of its first-year allocation for SIG related activities in schools that will be served with federal FY 2010 SIG funds

Activities must align to schools' needs assessment and requirements of the intervention model; represent change; be reasonable, necessary, and allowable; be researched-based; and be implemented prior to the beginning of the 2012-2013 academic school year.

**Activity Categories with Sample Activities:**

***Family and Community Engagement:*** Hold community meetings to review school performance, discuss the school interventions to be implemented, and develop school improvement plans aligned with student needs; survey students and parents to gauge needs of students, families, and the community; communicate with parents and the community about school status, improvement plans, choice options., and local service providers for health, nutrition, or social services through press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, and direct mail; assist families in transitioning to new schools if their current school is implementing the closure model by providing counseling or holding meetings specifically regarding their choices; or hold open houses or orientation activities specifically for students attending a new school if their prior school is implementing the closure model.

**Staffing:** Recruit and hire the incoming principal, leadership team, instructional staff, and administrative support; or evaluate the strengths and areas of need of current staff.

**Instructional Programs:** Provide remediation and enrichment to students in schools that will implement an intervention model at the start of the 2011-2012 school year through programs with evidence of raising achievement; identify and purchase instructional materials that are research-based, aligned with State academic standards, and have data-based evidence of raising student achievement; or compensate staff for instructional planning, such as examining student data, developing a curriculum that is aligned to State standards and aligned vertically from one grade level to another, collaborating within and across disciplines, and devising student assessments.

**Professional Development and Support:** Train staff on the implementation of new or revised instructional programs and policies that are aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; provide instructional support for returning staff members, such as classroom coaching, structured common planning time, mentoring, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice, that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional plan and the school's intervention model; or train staff on the new evaluation system and locally adopted competencies.

**Preparation for Accountability Measures:** Develop and pilot a data system for use in SIG-funded schools; analyze data on leading baseline indicators; or develop and adopt interim assessments for use in SIG-funded schools.

**Professional Development:**

Ongoing professional development, including job-embedded training designed to build capacity and support staff, is an integral part of successful school reform. While no specific amount of SIG funds are required for professional development, plans for professional development to be provided through SIG must be included in TSIPP Component 4 (goals, actions steps, and implementation plans). This includes literacy and mathematics training for the staff unless the school demonstrates proficiency in this area.

Who in the LEA will ensure implementation of professional development plans with SIG funds?

Provide this school's PD plan including topics and projected dates.

